1485 h 16

The STORY of the ORDINATION OF OUR First Biſhops in Queen *ELIZABETH*'s Reign AT THE NAG's-HEAD TAVERN in *Cheapſide*,

Thoroughly Examined;

And proved to be

A Late-invented, Inconſiſtent, Self-contradicting, and Abſurd FABLE.

WITH

A View of the Caſe between HORNE and BONNER, and of the Writings of STAPLETON, HARDING, and SANDERS.

Whereby it is proved,

That neither BONNER nor thoſe Writers ever heard of the *Tavern-Ordination*, or called in queſtion the *Conſecration* of PARKER, JEWELL, HORNE, *&c.* at the Arch-Biſhop's Chapel at *Lambeth*.

In Anſwer to what is pretended to the contrary, by F. LE QUIEN, in his Two Treatiſes, *Ann.* 1725, and 1730, *Of the* Nullity *of the* Engliſh *Ordinations*; and by an *Engliſh* anonymous Writer of *Remarks*, on F. LE COURAYER's *Diſſertation* in Defenſe of their Validity.

With Occaſional Reflections on the Author of, *The* Nullity *of the* Prelatick *Clergy and Church of* England.

By *THOMAS BROWNE*, B. D.
Formerly Fellow of St. JOHN's Coll. *Cambridge*.

LONDON:
Printed for WILLIAM INNYS at the Weſt End of St. *Paul*'s. MDCCXXXI.



TO

THE HONOURABLE

Sir *Francis Leiceſter*, Bar^t.

Of TABLEY in *Cheſhire*,

THIS

DISCOURSE

Is humbly Dedicated,

In grateful Acknowledgment of his

Long Favour and Friendſhip to the Author;

And of a never-to-be-forgotten Inſtance of it,

In his moſt Free, Charitable, and Generous Support of him,

Under the Infirmities of a very advanced Age,

AND

The irreparable Ruin of his Fortunes,

By a late, too general, Calamity.



THE PREFACE.

THE *Writer* of the following *Diſcourſe* had occaſion, a great many Years ſince, to defend the *Validity* of the Ordination of Arch-Biſhop *Parker* and our firſt Biſhops, in the Beginning of Queen *Elizabeth*'s Reign, in a *Latin* Sermon *Ad Clerum*, preached before a Learned Audience, and printed afterwards, together with another Sermon, proving the *Canonicalneſs* of their Ordination, tranſlated from the *Engliſh*. His Deſign was, in thoſe two Diſcourſes, to give a ſatisfactory Anſwer to the Objections of our Adverſaries of the Church of *Rome*, againſt the Ordinations of *Parker* and his Brethren, both in point of *Fact* and *Right*. And the Queſtion of *Fact* he ſhould have treated of in the firſt place, if he had not found Reaſon to declare his Senſe, that the Relation of our Biſhops being ordained at the [a] *Nag's-Head Tavern*, did not deſerve to have any place in the Diſpute, or to be conſidered as a fair Point

[a] Concio ad Clerum coram Acad. Cantab. A. 1687. p. 4, 26, 27.

of Controverſy, between Us and the *Romaniſts*, but to be looked upon as a *Silly Fable*, and *Abominable Scandal.* The Reaſons of his thinking no better of it, he laid down in a ſhort Compaſs at the end of the firſt Sermon.

He may now be thought to ſtand in need of an Apology, for making that Part of the Diſpute, of which he had then and ſtill has ſo mean an Opinion, the Subject, by itſelf, of an entire and pretty large Diſcourſe. But that which, he muſt own, did in a manner provoke him to it, was the reading of the firſt Tome of F. *Le Quien*'s firſt *Treatiſe* of the *Nullity of the* Engliſh *Ordinations*, lately ſeconded by *Another* upon the ſame Subject. By reading that Part of this Author's firſt Work, he ſaw, that notwithſtanding the Tavern-Story had been ſufficiently confuted and expoſed, by Mr. *Maſon*, at its firſt Appearance, and by Biſhop *Bramhall* half a Century after, when it was revived again in the *late Times*; yet the Credit of it was not ſo far ſunk, in the Opinion at leaſt of ſome Bigots of the Party, but that a Man of Reputation for Learning and Judgment could, at this time of day, think it not below him to appear in the Defence of it. The *Father* tells us, [b] There are *Two Relations of* Matthew Parker's *Conſecration in the* Engliſh *Writers*; *the one of the* Proteſtants, *the other of the* Catholicks. Two

[b] T. 1. ch. 6. p. 173.

Relations!

Relations! the latter of which is the Story of the Ordination at the *Tavern*, which he thinks fit to put upon the level with the Account of the Ordination at *Lambeth*, taken from our publick Regiſters and Records. He gives the Hiſtory from *Champney*, and ſets it forth with the Air of a credible and plauſible Relation, and aſſures his Readers that there is [c] *nothing in it that ſmells ſo ſtrong of Fable, or is ſo ridiculous as we pretend:* And then makes it his Buſineſs, for more than 300 Pages, to the End of his firſt Tome, to ſhew, by diſproving the *Lambeth* Account, that our firſt Biſhops muſt be believed either to have had only that Mock-Conſecration, or none at all.

He was ſeconded, ſome time after, by an *Anonymous Engliſh* Writer of that Communion, who with a greater degree of Confidence, whatever we may find to be the Meaſure of his Learning or Judgment, declares, that, of the [d] *Two Accounts that of the* Nag's-Head *is the much better ſupported*; and that, [e] *conſidering all things, the mere Likelihoods will be found ſtronger in favour of that Account than againſt it:* And that its being [f] *ſo very credibly atteſted, and confirmed by the Weakneſs of our Objections againſt it, proves the* Lambeth *Account to be incredible.*

[c] Ch. 7. p. 226. [d] Remarks upon F. Le Courayer's Defence of the Engliſh Ordinations, p. 169. [e] P. 190. [f] Ch. 5. S. 12, 13.

This gave me ſome Reaſon to think, that the ſcandalous Impoſture ſtill wanted to be laid open more particularly and fully to the publick View; that ſo the Party, when they were made ſenſible that it is nothing but an heap of Abſurdities, Inconſiſtencies, and Contradictions, might at laſt ſee a Neceſſity of letting it drop for mere Shame, and never offering to trouble the World any more with it. The proper Way for this I conceived would be, to give the Reader a Sight of the Hiſtory, not as we have it from *Champney* only (as *Le Quien* and moſt of their Writers do) but as it is related in Whole or Part by every one of the firſt Authors, and then to let him ſee what muſt be made of it out of them all, conſidered apart, or compared together. By this Method the Reader will find it plainly diſcovered, Firſt, [g] that the Story was but newly invented when it appeared in Print in the firſt Author, forty Years after the time of the Pretended Fact; and was known at the time when it was firſt publiſhed, to none, or very few, beſides the Author. Secondly, [h] that his and the ſeveral following Relations are ſo contradictory to one another, that, as they all pretend to relate the ſame Hiſtory, from the ſame original Report and Tradition, we cannot give Credit to any one of them for want of knowing which of them we ought

[g] Infr. p. 70, 71, &c. [h] Infr. p. 77. ad p. 131.

to

to believe. Thirdly, [i] that the many and great Abſurdities in the Particulars of the Story ſhew it to be nothing better than Romance and Fable. To have this clearly and fully laid open, from a View of the Authors themſelves, before the Eyes of every one that reads the following *Diſcourſe*, may anſwer the End of the *Writer* of it, and effectually diſcourage any Perſon of Senſe and Modeſty among our *Adverſaries*, from taking upon him to abet or countenance this Piece of Hiſtory.

Another thing wherein the reading of F. *Le Quien* might make a Member of the Church of *England* think there is occaſion for ſome more Pains to be taken on our Side, is to bring our Adverſaries, if poſſible, to a Senſe of the Neceſſity of giving over that ſtrange Confidence, whereby they have all along endeavoured to cheat their Readers into a Belief, that the *Popiſh Biſhops* and *Writers* of that time, particularly *Bonner*, *Harding*, *Stapleton*, and *Sanders*, were all of them fully informed of the Ordination of *Parker* and his Brethren at the *Nag's-Head*. That they muſt certainly have been informed of it, if there had been any ſuch Fact, cannot be denied, either by us or our Adverſaries, and their being utterly ignorant of it, is alledged by us, with very good Reaſon, as a Proof that there never was any ſuch thing. But this obliges

[i] Infr. ch. 5.

the Advocates of the Fable to declare ſo much the more poſitively, that their Biſhops and Divines knew very well that our Prelates had no other but that Mock-Ordination; that it was publick and notorious ſoon after the time, and objected very early by them, and made the Subject of Diſpute for fifty Years, without any Evidence being produced in all that time on our Side, to ſhew that *Parker* and the reſt of the Biſhops were conſecrated at the Time and Place, and by the Perſons and the Form related afterwards in the *Regiſter* cited by Mr. *Maſon*, *A.* 1613. and conſequently, that the *Regiſter* was newly invented when he produced it, and our firſt Biſhops never had any ſuch Conſecration as is there related. This is confidently aſſerted by *Fitzherbert*, and his Cotemporaries, *Fitz-Simon* and *Champney*. *Fitzherbert* [k] makes it the Subject of *Harding*'s Diſpute againſt *Jewell* about his Orders, and *Stapleton*'s againſt *Horne*. *Fitz-Simon* [l] refers to them and others of their Writers, as Evidences of the Truth of his *Story*: And *Champney* [m], beſides his Argument for it from *Bonner*'s Plea and the Iſſue of it, produces ſeveral Allegations from them, in order to confirm the Truth of his *Narrative*. The ſame Authorities are alledged in the Treatiſe of *Catholick Faith and Hereſy*, with a Revival of *Champney*'s Story: And the Author of

[k] Infr. p. 235. [l] Infr. p. 237, 238. [m] Ibid.

that

that Treatiſe, in his ſecond Work, of the *Nullity of the Prelatick Clergy and Church of* England, tells us their [n] *Biſhops and Doctors related the Tradition to* Fitzherbert, Champney, &c. *which they afterwards publiſhed in Print.* To compleat theſe Evidences, *Le Quien* [o] heaps up a great number of Citations; and ſhould, if he proſecuted the ſame Deſign as thoſe that went before him, have concluded that theſe Teſtimonies are a Proof that *Bonner, Stapleton, Harding, &c.* believed, and related, and laid to the Charge of our firſt Biſhops, their having none but that ſcandalous Ordination at the *Nag's-Head.* But the *Father*, when it comes to be his Buſineſs to eſtabliſh the Truth and Authority of the Story by the Atteſtation of the moſt competent and ſubſtantial Witneſſes, thoſe that were upon the Spot at the very time of the Pretended Fact, ſoon diſcovers how little he is able to do that ſervice to the Cauſe, and finds himſelf obliged to ſhift it off to another Point of Diſpute, *viz.* [p] That *Bonner* and the reſt, who muſt have ſoon been fully informed of that Tranſaction, are Evidences, not that *Parker* and his Brethren had no Ordination but that at the Tavern, but only, that they had not the Conſecration at *Lambeth* reported by us from the Publick Acts, nor (as *Le Quien* is willing to carry the Matter to a much greater height than he had Occa-

[n] P. 75. inſr. p. 115. [o] T. 1. ch. 8. S. 2. [p] Ibid.

ſion for) *any Ordination* or *Impoſition of Hands whatſoever*, or *any Ceremony* or *Solemnity* to make them Biſhops. This it is, and no more, that he takes upon him to prove *directly* from their Teſtimonies, without a Word of their aſſerting the Fact of the Tavern-Ordination, except their affirming that Ordination is a neceſſary Conſequence of their denying the Conſecration at *Lambeth*. He is not wanting, as Occaſion offers in the Courſe of his Arguments, to interpret any thing that he meets with [q] in favour of the *Fable*, if there be any Colour for it; and ſo diſcovers himſelf to be willing to give it all the Countenance he can from the Authority of theſe Witneſſes, but not to have the Confidence to tell us they declare poſitively for the Truth of it. And at laſt, in his Treatiſe of this Year, he bids us take Notice, [r] *after all his Arguments from* Stapleton's *Teſtimony*, that he does not *bring in any thing there relating to the* Nag's-Head *Ordination*; and is ready to compound the Matter with us, and to give up that Piece of Hiſtory for [s] *Romance* and *Fable*, if he may but gain his Point, that the Account of the Conſecration of *Parker*, *&c.* at *Lambeth* is no better.

To put an End effectually to both theſe Pretences, of making Proof from theſe Au-

[q] T. 1. p. 285, 299, 302. [r] Part 1. ch. 1. S. 1. p. 72.
[s] Ch. 1. S. 7. p. 180.

thorities,

thorities, either (as it is attempted by *Fitzherbert*, *Champney*, *&c.*) that our Biſhops were ordained at the *Tavern*, or (as inſtead of that, *Le Quien* is willing to make the World believe) that they had no Conſecration at all, or had not that Conſecration which we give an account of from the *Lambeth* Regiſter; and to leave no room for it to be ſaid, that there is ſtill more Evidence behind, or that what has been produced by our Adverſaries is *eluded*, as [t] *Le Quien* ſuggeſts, by *frivolous Evaſions and Diſtinctions:* It was proper to examine particularly and fully every Paſſage that has been, or might be alledged againſt our Ordinations, either from the [v] Caſe between *Horne* and *Bonner* (whoſe Plea againſt *Horne* that he was *No Biſhop*, and the Proceedings thereupon, are pretended by our Adverſaries to be a Demonſtration on their Side) or from the Writings of their Principal Authors, [w] *Sanders* in his *Hiſtory of the* Engliſh *Schiſm*; [x] *Stapleton* in his *Fortreſs of Faith*, and in all his following Works; and [y] *Harding*, in his *Confutation of* Jewell's *Apology*, and Reply to his *Defence* in the *Detection of* Jewell's *Errors*. Upon this View it will appear,

Firſt, that, notwithſtanding the [z] Bitterneſs and Malice of *Bonner*, and theſe *Writers*, againſt the Proteſtants, and their For-

[t] T. 1. p. 282. [v] Infr. ch. 6. [w] Infr. ch. 1. p. 2, 3, 4. and ch. 2. [x] Ch. 7, 8. [y] Infr. ch. 9, 10. [z] Infr. p. 188, 239, &c. 255, &c.

wardneſs

wardneſs to load them with Reproaches, diſcovers itſelf in ſo many inſtances, yet they never offer to charge our Biſhops with this ſcandalous Ordination; though in the Courſe of their Objections againſt them, it appears they had ſo frequent Occaſions, tempting, and in a manner provoking them, to take this Way of rendring the Reformed Church of *England* contemptible and odious to the Chriſtian World; and therefore their being utterly ſilent upon theſe Occaſions, is a Proof that they never knew of, and conſequently, that there never was, any ſuch Fact.

Secondly, that all that they really object againſt the Ordinations of our Biſhops, either may or muſt be interpreted to be nothing more than a Declaration that they were not, in their Judgment, valid, canonical, or legal, in reſpect of the Perſons of their Conſecrators, or the Form whereby they were conſecrated; without a Word that implies a Denial of their having any Conſecration at all, or of their being conſecrated by ſuch Perſons and by ſuch a Form as is recorded in the Publick Acts. This is ſhewed [a], againſt the confident Uſe that is made of the Allegations from them by *Le Quien*, and the Author of the *Remarks* upon F. *Le Courayer*; all whoſe Citations prove no more than that *Harding* (in whom it is moſt clear, tho' his Objecti-

[a] Infr. ch. 2, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10.

ons

ons againſt *Jewell* are moſtly inſiſted upon by our Adverſaries) as well as *Stapleton* and *Sanders*, deny that *Parker*, *Jewell*, and *Horne*, *&c.* had any true or lawful Biſhops for their Conſecrators. And it is ſhewed farther, to compleat the Reader's Satisfaction, that both the *Remarker* and *Le Quien* are under a Conviction that their Teſtimonies come to no more; the *Remarker* [b] firſt, as he makes the Denial of their being conſecrated by true Biſhops, the ſame thing with the Denial of the Fact of their Conſecration; and *Le Quien* after him, in his Treatiſe of this Year, [c] where he repeats the Paſſages from them, which he had in his firſt Work poſitively applied to prove that they deny our Biſhops having any Ordination or Impoſition of Hands *whatſoever*; but infers no more from the ſame Paſſages now, but that they deny their having *Epiſcopal* Impoſition of Hands: And yet requires of us to believe, [d] that their Writers charging *Parker* and his Brethren with the Want of having the Hands of Biſhops laid upon them, ſuch as were qualified to give them a *true* and *valid* Call to the Epiſcopal Function, is to be looked upon as a Denial, not of (that which it only can be a Denial of) the *Validity*, but of the *Fact*, of the Ordinations.

A third Task that the reading of F. *Le*

[b] Infr. ch. 7. n. 14, p. 290, &c. [c] Infr. ch. 11. p. 467, &c.
[d] Infr. p. 475, 494.

Quien

Quien might oblige a Member of the Church of *England* to impoſe upon himſelf, is to demonſtrate the Evidence we have of the Conſecration of our Biſhops, by a full and particular Diſcovery of our *Regiſters* and *Records*; and to juſtify their being genuine and authentick, againſt the Cavils of that *Father*, and of the Author of *Remarks upon F.* Le Courayer, and any other of our Adverſaries. But any Service that the Writer of this *Diſcourſe* might be willing or capable to do in this Particular, is ſuperſeded, by its being ſo compleatly and effectually done by a *Writer* of their Communion, who, beſides the Proof of his Judgment and Learning in the Diſpute about our Orders, has ſet the *Divines* of the Church of *Rome* an eminent Example of *Prudence* and *Diſcretion*, as well as of *Candor* and *Impartiality*, in ſubmitting to take the proper Method of being thoroughly informed of all Particulars, which were to be the Subject of his Enquiry, and with which a *Foreigner* could not otherwiſe be acquainted, from the beſt Hands here in *England*; and by this means, not only ſatisfying himſelf that the Acts of the Conſecrations of *Parker* and his Brethren in the *Lambeth* Regiſter are unqueſtionably genuine and authentick, but being able to make abundant Proof of it to the Chriſtian World; as he has done, both by anſwering the Exceptions of *Le Quien* and his other Adverſaries againſt the Regiſter, and by

laying open ſuch a number of the reſt of our Publick Acts, in the Regiſters of the ſeveral Biſhops, and of the Chapters of *Canterbury* and other Churches, and of the Offices of the Court of *Arches*, and the *Prerogative*, and in the Records of State in the *Rolls*; all which, by the Matter and the Dates of them, are concurrent Evidences of the reſpective Conſecrations of our Biſhops at that time. If the Acts of theſe Conſecrations can be pretended to be forged, the ſame Fraud and Forgery there muſt be in the reſt of thoſe Publick Acts, and ſuch a number of Perſons muſt be involved in the Guilt of it, as makes it impoſſible for the Cheat to paſs upon the Nation undiſcovered; much more, for the Queen and both the Houſes of Peers and Commons in the Parliament 1566, within ſo little diſtance from the time of the Conſecrations, to declare all the Biſhops from the Beginning of the Queen's Reign to have been *duly and orderly* elected, confirmed, and conſecrated, upon the Evidence of the *Records* which they refer to; that is, the Church-Records, the Acts of Election, in the Regiſters of the Chapters, and of Confirmation and Conſecration in the Arch-Biſhop's Regiſter, as well as the Records of State in the Rolls, of the Queen's Patents of *Conge d' eſlire*, giving the Chapters a Legal Warrant to elect them, and her Mandates and Commiſſions, authorizing the Arch Biſhop or Biſhops to confirm and conſecrate them.

F. *Le*

F. *Le Quien* muſt be ſenſible, that he would not have been denied the Liberty which was granted to another Perſon of the ſame Profeſſion, of having Acceſs in a proper manner, by himſelf, or ſuch other Perſons as he ſhould deſire, to the Sight and Peruſal of our Publick Acts, and to have, if it were deſired, authentick Copies of any of them; and he muſt have been afterwards at full Liberty to give the Publick his Judgment upon them, as his Reaſon and Conſcience ſhould direct him. But he is now to give the World an Account, why he rather made it his Choice to ſit in the dark, and to have either no Information at all from the proper Place, or only by the Hands of ſuch Perſons as ſeem to have made it their Buſineſs to impoſe upon and miſlead him: The Conſequence of which has been, his expoſing himſelf to the Cenſure of all fair and unprejudiced Perſons, by his confidently pronouncing, without any Warrant, that our Records are to be looked upon as falſe and forged; beſides (as has been [c] ſhewed in ſeveral Inſtances) his aſſerting at random whatever he thinks fit, however falſe and groundleſs it is, of our Affairs in Church and State.

But whatever may be ſaid in Excuſe for the *Father's* Conduct at a *Diſtance*, no ſuch Plea can be made for the Part which the Author of the *Remarks upon F.* Le Courayer

[c] Inſr. 175, 218, 312, 482.

has

has been pleaſed to act here *at home*, who could not want Opportunities of enquiring himſelf, or having proper Enquiries made, at the Places where our Evidences are to be ſeen; but thought it became him, without taking any ſuch Care, to give the World an *Idea* of all our Records, as of a [f] *great Heap of Writings forged on purpoſe*, to make Evidence of the *Pretended Titles* of our Prelates to their Sees and Epiſcopal Functions. He and *Le Quien* have had for ſome Years laid before them, by the *Author* whom he *remarks* upon, theſe full and unconteſtable Evidences of the Truth of the Acts of Conſecration of our firſt Biſhops; with an Anſwer to all the *Cavils*, of *Le Quien* and others firſt, and him after them, againſt their Authority; which their Concern to impoſe upon their Readers, inſtead of ſetting the Matter before them in a true and clear Light, prompted them to ſtudy to find out or inforce. There is no Reaſon to apprehend, but that what farther Exceptions are ſtarted by *Le Quien* in his laſt Treatiſe, inſtead of making good thoſe which he had brought in his Treatiſe before, will as eaſily be ſhewed to be weak and groundleſs, by the *ſame Hand*.

And I hope, that, which appears now to be his main Ground and laſt Refuge, to give it in his own Words, [g] *The uniform Teſtimo-*

[f] P. 52. Part 1. Pref. p. x.

[g] La Nullitè des Ordin. Angl. A. 1730.

nies

nies of the Writers *of that time, who were upon the Place, and attentive to obſerve all that paſſed, and were Eye-Witneſſes, and obliged in point of Intereſt to be well aſſured*; whoſe Authority, in *Le Quien*'s Judgment, *ought to be preferred before the* Looſe Papers (as he expreſſes it) *or Books in MS. which were not produced till after their Deceaſe*: And a greater Teſtimony of a [h] *Catholick Biſhop, who being indicted by a Proteſtant Prelate, attacked the Whole Order within three or four Years after their Inſtitution, and with the Advice and Direction of three of the greateſt Eminency in the Profeſſion of the Law, maintained in* open Court *that the New Biſhops never received Impoſition of Hands from* any Biſhop (as the *Father* now expreſſes it, inſtead of their having never received any Impoſition of Hands *at all*:) Theſe Authorities, I hope, are ſufficiently proved to be nothing to his Purpoſe (of deſtroying the Authority of the *Lambeth* Regiſter, and diſproving the *very Fact* of the Conſecration of our firſt Biſhops) by a particular View, of all that is or may be alledged for that Intent, in the following Diſcourſe; and the *Counter-Ordination* at the *Tavern*, which he and the *Remarker*, and our other Adverſaries, are willing to abet and countenance (and to make it paſs upon the World as the only Ordination our Biſhops could have, inſtead of the true Ordination at

[h] Ibid. p. xi.

Lambeth)

Lambeth) confuted and expoſed in ſuch a manner, as may put an End to the Forwardneſs of any others to appear in the Defence of it.

Beſides *Le Quien* and the *Remarker*, whom I was moſt obliged to conſider, I have had frequent Occaſions to take notice of another *Writer*, the Author of two Treatiſes, of the *Catholick Faith and Hereſy*, and of *The Nullity of the Prelatick Clergy and Church of* England. The latter was written in Defence of the other in Reply to Biſhop *Bramhall's Conſecration of Proteſtant Biſhops vindicated*; and with Deſign, chiefly, to clear himſelf from the Charge of an impudent Lie and Calumny in his Story of Biſhop *Morton's Speech*. How likely a Method he has taken to make the Reader diſpoſed to believe him, is ſhewed in a proper [i] Place, by his beginning his Second Work with a daring and deliberate Falſification of *Harding's* Words: And of how little Service his Second Forgery, of the Lord *Audley's Depoſition*, is to his Purgation, is fully made appear by [k] F. *Le Courayer*. *Le Quien* [l] miſtakes the Year of *Morton's* Pretended Speech, which could not be in 1642, neither the Biſhop nor the Lord *Audley* being preſent in the Parliament that Year, and the Debates about the *Biſhops Votes* being in the Year before. Then indeed Lord *Audley* pretty conſtantly attended the Houſe of

[i] Infr. p. 400, &c. [k] Def. B. 2. ch. 5. [l] Tom. 1. p. 207.

Peers, having great Occaſion, as appears by the *Journals*, from a Cauſe of his own againſt the Lord *Cottington*, lying then before the Lords, and determined for that Lord againſt him, notwithſtanding the Succeſs he might promiſe himſelf from his Adverſary being ſo much in the Diſ-Favour of the Ruling Party in that Houſe. His Head had Reaſon to be ſo full of his own Buſineſs at that time, as to make him not ſo very attentive to the Speeches made in the Debate about the Biſhops; one whereof, very long, of the Lord *Say*, we have in Dr. *Nallſon's Collections*[m], wherein that Lord reflects more than once upon the Biſhop of *Lincoln* who had ſpoken before him, and was to be ſure as ready to obſerve the Speeches of any of the reſt of the Biſhop's Bench, and to take Advantage of ſuch an one as is forged by this Writer for *Morton*, deſtroying his own and his Brethrens Right to their Order and Peerage, by his own Confeſſion. But we find the Lord *Say* owning that he did not remember that he had heard ſuch a Speech; and declaring that he looked upon the Report of it as *an Invented Tale*; as appears from Dr. *Barwick's* Preface to his Publication at *London*, *A.* 1659. of Biſhop *Bramhall's Conſecration of Proteſtant Biſhops Vindicated*, and his *Schiſm Guarded*, printed together in 12mo at the *Hague*, the Year before.

[m] Vol. 2. p. 266.

The

The Author of the *Nullity* adds a *Poſtſcript* at the End of his Work, after the *Appendix* of the *Falſifications* which he lays to Biſhop *Morton*'s Charge, to invalidate the Biſhop's *Declaration* againſt the *Calumny* of the Pretended *Speech* in the *Houſe of Lords*. In this *Poſtſcript* he has two *Tales* more, which we may with good Reaſon aſcribe to the ſame fruitful *Invention*. The firſt is to make good his Charge of *Morton*'s *Falſifications*, " a *Secretary* of whoſe, (he ſays) late-" ly took his Oath in the Preſence of Two " Witneſſes, That upon tranſcribing a MS. " of his, he adviſed him how he found the " *Fathers corrupted* by him, and that the " *Falſification* was notorious; but *Morton* " would not correct it, but ſaid in great " Paſſion he would not be taught or ruled " by Young Men. This, he ſays, with o-" ther Falſifications of Dr. *Morton*, occa-" ſioned the Secretary's Converſion to the " Church of *Rome*." This, we may have good Reaſon to believe, is one and the ſame Story with that we have from [n] F. *Parſons*, of the Converſion of *Jewell*'s *Secretary* (or *Chaplain*, for he was not ſo fully informed whether of the two) upon the like Occaſion; which this Writer meeting with, after he had writ his *Appendix*, found it exactly fit for his Turn, putting only the Name of *Morton*, inſtead of *Jewell*; and he could not have taken his *Copy* from a better *Original*. The

[n] Wood's Athenæ Oxon. Vol. 1. p. 134. Ed. 1691.

Trick ſeems to be thought by the Party worthy to be put in Practice; for the next Succeſſor to *Morton* in the See of *Durham*, Biſhop *Coſin*, had the like Report raiſed, after his Death, of him and his *Secretary*, and it has been common there, as I have been informed, in the Mouth of the Party.

His other Tale is of a *Depoſition* of one Mr. *Plowden*, of what he had heard *from the Mouth of* Faircloth, one of the four Prieſts whom Arch-Biſhop *Abbot* ſent for to *Lambeth*, *Ann.* 1614. to ſhew them Arch-Biſhop *Parker*'s Regiſter, That *Faircloth* then told the Arch-Biſhop, "[o] My Lord, "my Father was a Proteſtant, and kept a "Shop in *Cheapſide*, and aſſured me that "himſelf was preſent at *Parker*'s and the "firſt Proteſtant Biſhops Conſecration at the "*Nag's-Head* in *Cheapſide*, *&c.* This ſup-"poſed, my Lord, I cannot but judge this "is a forged Regiſter."

We ſee that, beſides the Lord *Audley*, he has other *Deponents* at his Command, ſuch as Biſhop *Morton*'s Secretary, and Mr. *Plowden*, to make Oath of, or to teſtify, what he has occaſion for; and we may give as much Credit to what they are his Vouchers for at the End of his Book, as to that for which he vouches *Harding* (tho' he knows himſelf to be in a Lie) at the Beginning. It might have been ſome Check to his Forwardneſs

[o] Ward's Controverſy of Ordination truly ſtated, p 43. Remarks upon F. Le Courayer, p. 106.

about *Faircloth*, if he could have given himſelf leave to reflect, how impoſſible it muſt be, Firſt, for *Champney*, when, four Years after, he writ his Book *De Vocatione, &c.* and gives an Account[p] of what paſſed between the Arch-Biſhop and the four Prieſts, not to have a Word to ſay of this free Speech of one of them to the Arch-Biſhop, nor of the Fact of *Faircloth*'s Father being an Eye-witneſs of the *Nag's-Head* Conſecration, than which nothing could have been more ſeaſonable or to his Purpoſe: And, Secondly, for *Faircloth* himſelf, after this Declaration of his, of the *Aſſurance* which he had of the Tavern-Conſecration from his own *Father*, and the Proof from thence that the Regiſter muſt be a *Forgery*, to be one of the *Two*[q] of thoſe Prieſts, that ſent to deſire to have a ſecond View of that Regiſter, when he had known ſo long before enough to ſatisfy him that it muſt be forged. But it is pretty natural for thoſe that offer to impoſe upon the World by ſuch Stories, to diſcover the Falſhood of them themſelves, ſome way or other, to any Man that impartially conſiders that which he is told; as this Writer does in this Particular, and had done before, in his very firſt *Impoſture* of Biſhop [r] *Morton*'s Speech, which was intended for a Confirmation of the *Nag's-Head Story*, but plainly deſtroys the Authority of it, as it makes the *Proteſtant Biſhops be ordained at*

[p] P. 524, 526. [q] Champ. p. 527. [r] Infr. p. 406.

that Tavern, not by Scory, *but by ſome of the laſt* Engliſh *Biſhops of the Church of* Rome; in Contradiction to the Account in all the Writers of the Fable at the time when it was firſt publiſhed, and every one elſe that pretends to relate it, except the Author of the [f] *Legacy to Proteſtants*, and *H. W.* in his *Meditations.*

Le Quien alledges this Story [t] of *Faircloth*, together with *Morton*'s Speech, and the Lord *Audley*'s Teſtification, and the Teſtimony of the *Demonſtration of Diſcipline*, that our Ordinations were made *in a Corner*, as Proofs of the Truth of the *Nag's-Head* Conſecration; and it appears that he has very good Reaſon to own afterwards, *that they do not come up to a perfect Demonſtration* of that Fact. For *Plowden*'s Depoſition about *Faircloth* he cites the *Addenda* to the *Nullity, &c.* Whether the Addition or *Poſtſcript* may be in ſome of the printed Copies (tho' it is not in two of them that I have ſeen) I cannot tell, but have ſeen it my ſelf in Writing at the End of a *MS. Copy* of the Book, which I once had in my Hands for a few Hours, but could never obtain the Sight of it again. I could not then avoid taking Notice in the MS. of a *Date* at the End of the *Poſtſcript*, *Jan.* 10. 167⅝. and at the End of the Preface, before the Book, *Dec.* 21. 1675. which was obſerved by other Perſons at the ſame time; though the *Poſtſcript* begins with theſe Words, *Since the*

[f] Inſr. p. 123, 127. [t] T. 1. ch. 7. p. 201. & ſeq.

finiſhing

finiſhing of this Point, I have had Occaſion to find out more Particulars, and then goes on to the Stories of the Biſhop's *Secretary* and *Faircloth*. This might make it ſeem probable, that there was no great Diſtance of Time between the writing of the Book and the Addition of the Poſtſcript; but of this we are kept in the dark, and muſt leave it to the Party themſelves to reconcile the firſt Words in the Poſtſcript and theſe Dates, with the time that we have in the *Title Page*, when the Book is ſaid to be printed, *A.* 1659. Dr. *Barwick*, in his Account that Year of Biſhop *Morton*'s Life and Death, ſpeaks as if we were then threatned with a *Reply* to Biſhop *Bramhall*'s *Conſecration of Proteſtant Biſhops Vindicated*, and bid to expect it very ſoon; and it did follow very ſoon if it came out the ſame Year. If it then came from the Preſs, with an Intent to make it publick from that time, it muſt be ſtrange that it ſhould have lain hid ſo long, and never come to the ſight of any Member of the Church of *England* for ſo many Years after the Publication. Two others of their Writers appeared very ſoon after Biſhop *Bramhall*'s *Vindication*, the Author of *Eraſtus Jun. A.* 1660. and of *Eraſtus Sen. A.* 1662. but both of them, inſtead of joining with the Author of the *Nullity*, *&c.* argue againſt the Biſhop and Mr. *Maſon* upon the Foot of the [v] *Lambeth Ordination*, in

[v] Infr. p. 222, &c.

Contradiction to the Fable which this Author pretends to maintain. So long after as the Year 1677, Dr. *Burnet*[x] makes Mention of thoſe Two Writers, and writes in Anſwer to a Third, who proceeds upon the ſame Grounds with them; but it plainly appears, tho' it was hardly poſſible to eſcape him, that he had never had at that time a ſight of this Work. The *Depoſition* of the Lord *Audley* required to be made publick preſently, to ſatisfy the World of his being the [y] *Antient Peer* from whom the Story of Biſhop *Morton*'s Speech was to have its Authority, and of his owning that the *Jeſuit* had it from his Mouth; and we may believe, that if that Lord had been taken out of the World as ſoon as Biſhop *Bramhall*, *A.* 1663. the Writer, and the Party, would have then thought themſelves ſecure from being contradicted; but as that Peer was ſtill living ſo many Years after the Biſhop's Deceaſe, they might have Reaſon to think themſelves obliged to let his Teſtimony lie concealed till they might find a proper time. As far as I find, the firſt Notice we had of it was not till the Year 1716, from the Notes in *Ward*'s *Canto's* of the *Reformation*, where there is an *Extract* of it from the Writer of the *Nullity*, *&c.* The Book it ſelf might as well have been preſented to the View of the Members of

[x] Vindication of the Ordinations of the Church of England, p. 21. [y] Treatiſe of Catholick Faith and Hereſy, p. 9. Bramhall's Works, p. 430.

our

our Church at that time, but it has been ſtill kept almoſt wholly undiſcovered to any but the Party themſelves; ſo that I could not have the Peruſal of it without the Favour of a *very Noble Peer*, whoſe Generoſity and Goodneſs renders his *Incomparable Library* an Univerſal Benefit; I ſhall eaſily be underſtood to mean the *Earl* of *Oxford*. After the reading and comparing it with Biſhop *Bramhall*'s *Vindication*, to which it was intended for a *Reply*, tho' I could not think it very ſtrange for ſuch a Writer as the Poet *Ward*, or his *Annotator*, to pronounce confidently that this Author *fully confutes* Bramhall, *and makes him a Lyar*; yet it was ſome Surprize to find *Le Quien*[z] affirming as poſitively *that he had given a ſolid Anſwer to* Bramhall's *Diſcourſe in every Point*. But it may be moſt for the *Father*'s Reputation, for us to believe that *Ward*'s Authority was of ſo great Weight with him, that he thought it needleſs to read the Author himſelf carefully, and to compare him with Biſhop *Bramhall:* And I may appeal to any one that is willing to take that Method, with an Intention to make himſelf a competent and impartial Judge of this *Writer*'s Performance, whether he will think it deſerves any other Cenſure, than that it is a plain Diſcovery of the Author's *Weakneſs* and *Sophiſtry* in point of Reaſoning, and of, that which is much worſe, a bareſaced *Impudence* and *Scurrility*, *Fraud* and *Impoſture*,

[z] Treat. 1. T. 1. Pref. p. lii. infr. p. 81.

A TA-

A

TABLE

OF THE

CONTENTS

OF THE

Several CHAPTERS.

CHAP. I. Page 1. *THE Writers of the* Nag's-Head *Story.* 2. Sanders's *Account of the Ordination of our firſt Biſhops.* 5. Le Quien's *Verſion of* Sanders. *His altering the Text of the Author in his* Extract. 7. *The Account of the Story in* Conſtable's *MS.* 8. Sacroboſco's *Relation.* 9. *The Relation of the Prefacer to* Parſons's Diſcuſſion. 11. Fitz-Simon's *Relation.* 14. Wadſworth's *Account.* 15. Kelliſon's *Relation.* 16. Champney's *Relation.* 20. Le Quien's *Addition to* Champney, *as Part of his Narrative, taken almoſt* verbatim *out of* Fitz-Simon.

CHAP. II. p. 26. *Reflections upon* Sanders. 27. *What he is pretended to ſay by* Le Quien *and the Author of* Remarks upon F. *Le Courayer.* 29. *Diſproof of what this Author pretends to make him ſay.* 32. *Diſproof of what* Le Quien *infers from his Words.* 34. *Reflections upon what* Sanders *ſays of the Want of a Metropolitan.* 37. *Confutation of what he ſays of the Proteſtants not having*

having Three *or* Two *Biſhops.* 40. *Falſe, that they had no Biſhops conſecrated before by other Biſhops.* 41. *Falſe, that they attempted to be conſecrated by an* Iriſh *Arch-Biſhop.* 43. *Reflections upon what he ſays of their being confirmed by a following Parliament.* 48. *Of what Credit he ought to be eſteemed.* 53. *The* Nag's-Head *Fable diſproved, by his being utterly ignorant of any ſuch Fact.* 58. Le Quien's *and the* Remarker's *frivolous Reaſons why he might be informed of the Story, and yet not ſpeak a Word of it.*

CHAP. III. p. 65. *Reflections upon* Conſtable's *Account.* 69. *Reflections upon* Sacroboſco's *Relation.* 70. *The Courſe of the Hiſtory from its firſt Publication by* Sacroboſco, *down to the time of* Champney's *Narrative.* 77. *The Relation of the two next Writers after* Sacroboſco, *inconſiſtent with, and contradictory to, his Relation.* 79. *The Diſagreement of the Writers in the Names and Number of the Perſons conſecrated.* 85. *Their Diſagreement about the Perſons intended to be the Conſecrators.* 88. *Their Diſagreement about the actual Conſecrators, and the Ceremony of Conſecration.* 93. *Summary of their Differences and Contradictions.* 95. *No Certainty what was* Neal's *Account of the Story.* 97. *An Expedient how to come to a Certainty.* 98. Fitz-Simon's *Narrative determined to be the authentick Hiſtory by a Decree of Pope* Clement XI.

CHAP. IV. p. 103. *The Confidence of the Author of the* Remarks *in aſſerting that all the other Writers relate the ſame Account with* Champney. 105. *His Neglect of the Profeſſion he had made of comparing the* Remarks *with the* Authors. 106. *His diſſembling the Diſagreement between the Writers, by his not producing their Accounts.* 108. *His making the Differences between them immaterial and inſignificant.* 114. *The* Nag's-Head *Story not to be credited, becauſe we cannot*

be certain which Relation to believe. 115. *The Pretence of a certain Tradition of it diſproved upon the ſame Ground.* 120. *The Tradition in the Author of the* Legacy left to Proteſtants. 122. *The Tradition in* H. W.*'s* Meditations upon the Marks of the True Church. 123. *The Abſurdities in the ſeveral Particulars of the* Meditations. 129. *The Old Tradition, in* Sacroboſco, *loſt in theſe two Writers, and revived by the Author of the Treatiſe of* Catholick Faith and Hereſy.

CHAP. V. p. 132. *The* Abſurdities *in the Particulars of the Story.* 133. Scory*'s being ordained by ſome of the ſame Perſons who were juſt before ordained by him.* 135. Parker *and the Biſhops repreſented as acting the Part of Fools or Madmen.* 140. *The Pretence falſe, that they were forced to it by the Popiſh Biſhops refuſing to ordain them.* 145. Champney*'s Introduction to his Narrative.* 146. *His Inconſiſtency with himſelf, in regard to the time.* 147. *His abſurd Repreſentation of* Landaff*'s Attempt to pay Obedience to Queen* Elizabeth*'s Mandate.* 151. Landaff *could have no Opportunity of coming to the Tavern to conſecrate* Parker. 154. Champney*'s Relation abſurd in the Account of* Bonner *and* Neal. 162. *The Abſurdity of his Account of* Scory, *and the Conſecration performed by him.* 168. *Our Biſhops Admiſſion into their Sees, and continuing in Poſſeſſion of them, impoſſible, if they had no other Conſecration.* 169. *The Pretence that the Parliament confirmed the Ordination at the* Nag's-Head. 175. Le Quien*'s falſe and ſcandalous Account of Arch-Biſhop* Parker*'s Conduct in the Parliament,* 8 Eliz.

CHAP. VI. p. 184. *None of the Popiſh Biſhops or Divines of that time ever heard of ſuch a Fact as the Tavern-Conſecration.* 185. *The Letters of ſome of thoſe Biſhops to the Queen and the Arch-Biſhop*

Biſhop ſhew that they were ignorant of it. 187. Bonner's *not having Information of it proved from his Defence of his Plea againſt* Horne. 192. *The true Ground of his Plea ſhewed to be contradictory to the* Nag's-Head *Story.* 197. *Confutation of what* Le Quien *and the* Remarker *pretend to the contrary.* 200. Bonner's *ſaying that* Horne *had not* four Biſhops at his Conſecration, *no Proof of his Denial that he was conſecrated by the four Perſons named in the Regiſter.* 204. *What moſt probably* Bonner *meant by that Expreſſion.* 208. *Summ of the Arguments to prove that* Bonner *was unacquainted with this pretended Fact.* 209. *Confutation of the* Remarker's *Anſwer to the Argument from the Ground of* Bonner's *Plea.* 212. Bonner's *Conduct while his Cauſe lay before the King's Bench, and when it was brought before the Parliament, proves that he had no Thoughts of objecting to* Horne *that he was ordained at the Tavern.* 216. Le Quien's Romantick *Account of the Caſe between* Bonner *and* Horne. 221. *His Attempt to prove that* Bonner *denied the Fact of* Horne's *Ordination, from what he makes to be the Office of our* Engliſh *Juries.* 225. *Confutation of the* Remarker's *Pretence that* Horne *declined bringing the Cauſe to a Trial, for fear it ſhould be proved upon him that he was ordained at the* Nag's-Head. 229. *Farther Obſervations from a MS. in the* Cotton *Library.*

CHAP. VII. p. 233. Bonner's *never having been informed of the Fact of the* Nag's-Head *Ordination, proves that the* Writers *of that time could have no Knowledge of it.* 234. Fitzherbert's *Pretence that it was known to* Harding *and* Stapleton, *and objected by them to* Jewell *and* Horne. 239. Stapleton's *Forwardneſs to vent any Scandal againſt the Reformers ſhews he could not have forborne to lay this Fact to their Charge, if he had known*

known of it. 249. *His firſt Objection againſt their Ordinations proves that he was utterly ignorant of their being ordained at the* Tavern. 260. *He does not deny* (*as* Le Quien *pretends*) *that our Biſhops had any Impoſition of Hands* at all, *but only that they had Hands laid upon them by* True Biſhops. 262. *This proved from his Words alledged by* Le Quien, *in the ſeveral Places of his* Fortreſs of Faith, Counterblaſt to Horne, *and* Return of Untruths to *Jewell.* 271. *His ſaying that the Proteſtants* refuſe the Sacrament of Orders, *no Proof of his meaning that they refuſed Ordination.* 273. *His Words in the* Promptuarium Catholicum *cannot be underſtood of any thing more, than that our Prelates had no Impoſition of* Biſhops *Hands.* 280. *His Words in the* Relectio Principiorum Doctrinalium, *do not require to be underſtood in any other Senſe.* 290. *The* Remarker's *Ignorance of the true State of the* Point of Diſpute. 296. *The time of the Author's writing the* Relectio, &c. *proves that he then knew nothing of the* Nag's-Head *Story.*

CHAP. VIII. p. 300. *The* Counterblaſt *to* Horne *ſhews that* Stapleton *never called in queſtion the* Fact *of the Ordination of our Biſhops.* 301. *His Objection in the* Preface, *againſt the Legality of their Ordinations, ſhews that he owns they were ordained by K.* Edward's *Form.* 302. *His Objections in the firſt Chapter.* 304. Le Quien's *pretended Proof from thence of his Denial that they were conſecrated by K.* Edward's *Form.* 305. *The Author, by what he makes him ſay, muſt be guilty of a double Self-Contradiction.* 306. Le Quien's *Attempt to evade one of theſe Contradictions.* 307. *His Evaſion diſproved from the Author's Words and Deſign in the Preface.* 312. *His Diſtinction to clear* Stapleton *from that Self-Contradiction diſproved from our Hiſtory and Conſtitution.*

ſtitution. 315. *The Author, by* Le Quien's *Account, guilty of another Self-Contradiction.* 317. *And of a third.* 318. Stapleton's *Confeſſion in the* Counterblaſt, *that our Biſhops were conſecrated by King* Edward's *Form, ſhews there can be no Ground to pretend, from other Places of his Works, that he denies they were ſo conſecrated.* 319. *It ſhews alſo, from his Authority, that the other* Writers *of his time muſt either have no other Meaning, or what they ſay muſt be falſe.* 320. *The* Remarker's *Allegation from the Anſwer to the* Treatiſe of *Engliſh* Juſtice, *to prove that the Biſhops were not conſecrated by their own New Ordinal, confutes it ſelf.* 321. *What* Stapleton *ſays of the Caſe between* Bonner *and* Horne *implies no more than is conſiſtent with his owning that* Horne *was conſecrated by King* Edward's *Form.* 329. *Summary of what is ſaid in this and the former Chapter relating to his Teſtimony.*

CHAP. IX. p. 335. *State of the Queſtion relating to* Harding. 336. Le Quien's *Argument from his declaring that the* Proteſtants had no conſecrated Biſhops. 338. *His ſaying ſo no Proof that he denies they had any Ordination* at all, *but that they were ordained by* true Biſhops. 341. *The* Remarker's *Way of arguing upon the ſame Ground.* 344. *The Truth examined of what* Harding *ſays, That they* had no Conſecrated Biſhops. 346. Harding's *Queſtions to* Jewell *about his* Vocation. 347. *His Demand of him to prove his* Right *and* Authority *to execute the Office of a Biſhop, ſhews he did not intend to deny the* Fact *of* Jewell's *Ordination.* 350. Harding's *Queſtions no more than two,* How, *and by* Whom, Jewell *was conſecrated.* 351. Le Quien *and the* Remarker *add two more,* When, *and* Where. 352. *Proved fully from the Author's Queſtions to* Jewell, *and his Reaſons for them, that he never had any Thought of denying the*

the Fact (*but only the* Validity *and* Lawfulneſs) *of his Ordination.* 364. *The ſame proved from the like Queſtions put by him to himſelf, about his receiving the Order of Deacon in King* Edward's *time.* 369. Le Quien's *Way of arguing from* Harding's *Queſtions to* Jewell. 372. *His Argument, that* Harding's *denying* Jewell *was conſecrated by three Biſhops, ſhews the Regiſter to be falſe, becauſe it gives his Conſecrators the* Title *of Biſhops.* 374. *The Ridiculouſneſs of this Way of Reaſoning.* 378. *The* Remarker's *Way of arguing from* Harding's *Queſtions.* 379. *His Attempt to prove that* Barlow *was not* Parker's *Conſecrator by a* Disjunctive, *that either he was not his Conſecrator, or no true Biſhop.* 383. *His Argument that he was not* Parker's *Conſecrator, from* Harding's *objecting that all the Ordination that* Parker *and the reſt could pretend to was from the* New Miniſters. 387. *This Argument would be a Proof that* Parker *and our firſt Biſhops were ordained by none but* Themſelves, *according to the Account we have in the* Nag's-Head *Story.* 388. Harding's *Inſtances of other Caſes, which he makes parallel to* Jewell's *Caſe, ſhew that he had no Deſign to deny the* Fact *of his Ordination.*

CHAP. X. p. 397. *The Anſwer which our Adverſaries pretend* Jewell *ought to have made to* Harding's *Objections againſt the Orders of our Biſhops.* 398. Le Quien's *Attempt to prove that* Jewell's *Act of Conſecration was called for by* Harding. 399. *The Attempt of the Author of the* Nullity of the Prelatick Clergy, &c. *to prove that* Harding *expreſly required of* Jewell *to* ſhew the Regiſter *of his Conſecration.* 403. *That Author convicted of a plain Forgery, and a Falſification of* Harding's *Words.* 405. *The confident Uſe he makes of this Forgery throughout his Book.* 406. *Juſt Reflections upon the Character of that* Writer. 408. Harding's *Reaſon for his Demand of the*

Letters of Orders *ſhews he had no Thought of objecting againſt the* Fact, *but the* Validity *of the Ordinations.* 409. *Though* Jewell *had produced the* Regiſter, *it would not have been a ſatisfactory Anſwer to his Adverſary.* 412. Le Quien's *Reflections upon* Jewell's *Anſwer to* Harding *as* ſhuffling *and* evaſive. 413. *Proved that he gives a proper and direct Anſwer.* 416. *Proved that* Harding *makes a* ſhuffling *Reply, and miſrepreſents and falſifies* Jewell's *Anſwer.* 423. Le Quien's *interpreting* Jewell's *Words, of a Conſecration by* one *Biſhop being valid, as if he owned that himſelf was conſecrated by* Scory *only at the Tavern.* 426. *What* Harding *ſays upon this Occaſion ſhews he knew nothing of the* Nag's-Head *Ordination.* 431. *His Pretence that* Jewell *had not* yet anſwered *his Queſtions, at the ſame time when in his* Detection *he is ſetting down the Anſwers to them.* 434. Jewell *not obliged to prove that his Conſecrators were true Biſhops, except* Harding *had firſt offered ſome Arguments to prove the contrary.* 437. Le Quien's *and* Fitzherbert's *Reflections upon* Jewell's *Words,* Our Biſhops are made in Form and Order, &c. *as if he meant* other *Biſhops, and not* himſelf. 440. Harding's *Reply about the Arch-Biſhop's Conſecration.* 441. *His Reply no Proof that* Parker *was not conſecrated at* Lambeth, *nor that he was ordained at the* Nag's-Head. 448. Jewell's *making no Rejoinder to it of no Service to our Adverſaries.* 453. Le Quien *furniſhes us with a good Reaſon, why* Jewell *muſt think it impertinent to give* Harding *any Proof of the* Fact *of his Ordination.* 457. *His Pretence that* Harding, &c. *conteſted the Fact of the Ordination of our Biſhops, becauſe they muſt otherwiſe have been Fools or Madmen, to reproach them as having never been truly conſecrated.* 459. *The Arguing of the Author of the* Nullity of the Prelatick

latick Clergy, *that we ought out of* Charity *to* Harding *and* Stapleton, *to believe they were certain that there was no Conſecration at* Lambeth.

CHAP. XI. p. 465. Le Quien's *late Treatiſe of the* Nullity of the *Engliſh* Ordinations, *a Confutation of the former.* 466. *What he takes upon him to prove in his former Treatiſe.* 467. *This diſproved in the Treatiſe now publiſhed.* 468. *Proof of his confuting himſelf, by what he ſays in regard to* Stapleton. 471. *By what he ſays in regard to* Harding. 472. *By what he ſays in regard to* Sanders *and* Bonner. 475. *His falling into the ſame Miſtake with the* Remarker *about the* Point of Diſpute. 478. *His new Argument from an Expreſſion in* Stapleton's Fortreſs of Faith. 480. *His Pretence from the Preface to the* Counterblaſt, *that there was an Act of Parliament,* 28 Hen. 8. *of* the making of Biſhops, *but that it was ſince* left out *of the* Statute-Book. 481. *His Interpretation of* Stapleton's *Words,* the very Statutes. 483. *His Interpretation of* Harding's *Words,* Ancient Biſhops. 484. *His pretended Diſcoveries in* Bonner's *Caſe.* 487. *His Charge againſt F.* Le Courayer, *of an Omiſſion of* Heylin's *Words.* Ibid. *And of concealing the Argument of* Bonner *or his* Counſel, *in the* Cotton MS., *againſt* Parker's *Conſecration.* 489. *Of how little Service that Argument can be to* Le Quien's *Cauſe.* 492. *Concluſion.*

The Reader is desired to correct these Errors, especially in *p.* 180, and *p.* 182.

PAge 20. line 9. after thus, read (without so much as any Distinction of Points, to shew that it is a new Story.) p. 23. marg. r. [o] The Reformation. p. 60. marg. for Prefacer, read Preface. p. 79. marg. for Numbers, r. Number. p. 81. l. 31. r. Parker? p. 153. l. 17. for us, r. as. p. 158. l. penult. r. (as possibly. p. 180. l. 11. instead of, we find no more than one single Bishop, &c. to 1566. l. 16. r. we find no more than two Bishops made during that time, *Jones* of *Landaff*, who succeeded *Kitchin*, and was consecrated *May* 5. 1566. (Parker's *Regist. Part* 1. *fol.* 114. *b.*) and [n] *Robinson* of *Bangor*, who succeeded *Meyrick*, and was consecrated *Octob.* 20. in the same Year. p. 182. l. 16. instead of, *Robinson* of *Bangor*, *A.* 1566. and *Jones* of *Landaff*, *A.* 1567. r. *Jones* of *Landaff*, and *Robinson* of *Bangor*, *A.* 1566.) *ibid.* in marg. del. *Le Neve*'s *Fasti*, p. 522. p. 210. l. 8. r. at the Nag's-head. p. 264. l. 1. for *hâc*, r. *hoc*. p. 288. l. antepen. for Admonition, r. Demonstration of Discipline. p. 326. l. 1. r. (ita disponente Deo) l. 11. r. lupi isti. p. 275. l. antepen. r. connexion. p. 352. del. *N.* 4. p. 475. l. 31. r. deny.

THE NAG'S-HEAD FABLE

Thoroughly examined and confuted.

CHAP. I.

The Writers of the Nag's-head *Story.* Sanders's *Account of the Ordination of our firſt Biſhops.* Le Quien's *Verſion of* Sanders. *His altering the Text in the Extract from him. The Account of the Story in* Conſtable's *MS.* Sacroboſco's *Relation. The Relation of the Prefacer to* Parſons's *Diſcuſſion.* Fitz-Simon's *Relation.* Wadſworth's *Account.* Kelliſon's *Relation.* Champney's *Relation.* Le Quien's *Addition as part of* Champney's *Narrative, taken almoſt* verbatim *out of* Fitz-Simon.

1. THE Story of the Conſecration of our firſt Biſhops in Q. *Elizabeth*'s Reign, at the *Nag's-Head* Tavern, will be made appear, in the moſt eaſy and effectual manner, to deſerve the Name that we give it, of an Abſurd Fable and Impudent Calumny, if it be laid open as it ſtands in the ſeveral Authors from whom we have it, *The Writers of the* Nag's-Head *Story.*

Conſtable, *Holywood* or *Sacroboſco*, the Author of the *Preface* to the *Diſcuſſion* of *F. Parſons*, *Fitz-Simon*, *Wadſworth*, *Kelliſon*, and *Champney:* And what they ſay I ſhall faithfully preſent to the Reader's View. But I muſt firſt ſet down ſome Paſſages relating to the Ordination of our Biſhops, out of the Hiſtorian of the *Engliſh Schiſm*, *Nicholas Sanders*; who tho' he does not relate the Particulars of the Story in his Account of their Ordination, yet appears to have laid a Foundation for thoſe that came after him to make a Supplement to his imperfect Relation, by filling up all that he had left blank, and patching it up ſo as to make a compleat Narrative.

Tranſlation of Sanders's *Account of the Ordination of our firſt Biſhops.*

2. The Paſſages in *Sanders* which I ſhall faithfully tranſlate from the *Latin*, are taken out of ſix or ſeven Pages (from *fol.* 164 to 167) in the firſt Edition of his Hiſtory of the *Engliſh* Schiſm, printed at *Colen*, *Ann.* 1585. which Edition I chuſe, becauſe it is the ſame with that which F. *Le Quien* cites and tranſlates; tho' it differs here a little, and very much more in other Places, from the Edition publiſhed the very next Year at *Rome*, and reprinted two Years after that, at *Ingolſtadt*, and followed exactly, for ought I find, by every one of the ſubſequent Editions from that time.

" [a] Q. *Elizabeth* diſpoſed of the Dignities and Of-
" fices of the Church among her *Lutherans* and
" *Calviniſts*; but moſtly to thoſe of the latter
" Sort: For there were come in great haſte to di-
" vide the Spoil (of the Church-Preferments)
" thoſe very Perſons that a little before, upon
" *Calvin*'s Principles, abhorred the proud and
" antichriſtian Rule and Government of the Pre-
" lates——— The [b] *Calviniſts* greedily and with-
" out ſcruple graſped after the Biſhopricks and

[a] Fol. 164. [b] Fol. 165.

" other

" other Dignities of the Church, even then when " they knew the true Biſhops were yet living, " holding Communion with the whole World, " and not deprived for any juſt Cauſe, or by any " lawful Authority——— The Queen indeed " gave theſe Preferments by her Letters Patents, " but ſo that it was neceſſary for thoſe upon " whom they were conferred to be ordained by " certain Perſons, and by a certain Form and " Manner, agreeably to the Laws of the Realm. " *Henry* VIII. the Author of the Schiſm, after " he had withdrawn his Realm from the Com- " munion of the Church, and the Apoſtolick " See, paſſed an Act, That no Perſon elected " Biſhop ſhould ſue for the Pope's Bull or Man- " date for his Conſecration, but only have the " King's Letters Patents, upon which being con- " ſecrated by three Biſhops, with the Conſent " of the Metropolitan, he ſhould be by Act of " Parliament, conformably to the Canons of the " Church, a true Biſhop: Nor ſhould any Per- " ſon be owned as ſuch who was ordained in any " other manner. However, he ordered the Form " of Conſecration and ſolemn Unction then in " uſe in the Church to be obſerved; which " K. *Edward* afterwards laid aſide, and appoint- " ed ſeveral *Calviniſtical* Prayers in the place of " it[c]; but continued in force the former Act re- " lating to the number of Biſhops who were to " be preſent and to lay Hands upon the Perſon to " be ordained. Theſe new Statutes Q. *Mary* re- " pealed, but Q. *Elizabeth* revived them. So " that it was neceſſary for theſe Biſhops of the " Queen's alſo to be ſo ordained, that with the " Conſent of the Metropolitan two or three Bi- " ſhops ſhould aſſiſt and lay Hands upon them. " But it fell out pleaſantly *(perridiculè)* that

[c] Fol. 166.

" when theſe Superintendents were to be conſe-
" crated, they could neither prevail with the
" Catholick Biſhops to lay Hands upon them,
" nor had they among themſelves, of their own
" ſect, three, or two Biſhops, or one Metropo-
" litan conſecrated before by other Biſhops, by
" whoſe Conſent and Impoſition of Hands they
" might be conſecrated; They were very urgent
" with an *Iriſh* Archbiſhop, whom they had then
" in Priſon at *London*, that he would help them
" in this Neceſſity, and made him the Offer of
" his Liberty, and a good Reward if he would
" preſide in their Ordination; but the Good Man
" could not be perſuaded by any means to lay
" his holy Hands upon Hereticks, nor to be
" Partaker of other Mens Sins. So, being deſ-
" titute of all lawful Ordination, when they were
" commonly ſaid, and really proved by the very
" Laws of *England*, to be no Biſhops, they were
" forced to implore the Aſſiſtance of the ſecu-
" lar Arm, that they might in a following Par-
" liament be confirmed by the Lay-Power, by
" whoſe Authority it might be forgiven them if
" any thing had been done or omitted irregularly
" and contrary to Law, in their former Inaugu-
" ration: And this, after they had executed the
" Office of Biſhops, and ſat in the Epiſcopal
" Chair, for ſome Years [d], without any Epiſcopal
" Conſecration. Hence they had the Name
" given them of Parliament-Biſhops. But what-
" ſoever kind of Biſhops theſe falſe Biſhops were,
" and in what manner ſoever they were made,
" from ravening Cubs and Lions Whelps, they
" came to be raging and devouring Lions and
" Wolves, and learnt to prey upon and lord it
" over the Clergy and People, and to rob and op-
" preſs them after a ſtrange and incredible man-
" ner."

[d] Fol. 167.

3. Here

3. Here the Reader has before him what *Sanders* ſays of our firſt Ordinations: And the greateſt part of what I have rendred into *Engliſh*, F. *Le Quien* gives us in *French* [e]; and to anſwer his *French* Verſion and Paraphraſe, ſets down immediately after it an Extract from the Original in *Latin*. This is a good Shew of fair dealing; and we may expect to find that he gives us faithfully the Text of his Author, and that his Verſion agrees exactly with the Original: But if the Reader will take the Trouble, he will ſoon ſee how far the *Father*'s Fidelity and Exactneſs may be depended upon. The Words which I have tranſlated above, So being deſtitute of all lawful Ordination, (*Ita omni legitimâ Ordinatione deſtituti,*) *Le Quien* renders in the *French* [f], *Ainſi ils ne reçûrent aucune Ordination*; that is, So they did not receive *any* Ordination *at all*. Why he makes it, inſtead of *no lawful Ordination*, (as the Word *legitimâ* in the Text requires) *no Ordination at all*, the Father is to give us a Reaſon. He does indeed let the Word *legitimâ* ſtand in the Text, tho' he paſſes it over in the Tranſlation: But he takes more Liberty afterwards near the end of his Extract from *Sanders* [g], where in thoſe Words, *abſque ullâ* Epiſcopali *Conſecratione*, he ſtrikes out *Epiſcopali*; and his Verſion has the ſame Omiſſion, *ſans avoir aucune Conſecration*; that is, without having *any* Conſecration *at all*, inſtead of, without having any *Epiſcopal* Conſecration. For what Intent he thus tranſlates and cites his Author, it is very eaſy to diſcern. It is his Buſineſs to ſhew that *He*, as well as *Harding* and others of that time, affirm that our firſt Biſhops came into their Sees, [h] *without any Conſe-*

Father Le Quien's *Verſion of* Sanders.

His altering the Text of the Author in his Extract.

[e] Nullite des Ordinations Anglicanes, T. 1. p. 310, &c.
[f] P. 311. [g] P. 313. [h] T. 1. p. 246, 265.

cration whatſoever; [i] *without Solemnity, without Ceremony:* [k] that *they thought there was no Neceſſity of any Ordination,* but *took Poſſeſſion of their Sees by vertue of the Queen's Letters Patents without any Eccleſiaſtical Ceremony or Impoſition of Hands.* To make no more of his Author's Words than that they had *no lawful* or *no Epiſcopal* Conſecration, would not come up to this Deſign; he had Reaſon therefore to attempt to make his Readers believe, that he ſays they had *no* Ordination *at all. Sanders* might know they were ordained by the Perſons named in the *Lambeth* Regiſter, and by the Form in K. *Edward*'s Ordinal, and yet ſay they had no lawful and no Epiſcopal Ordination, becauſe he looked upon that Form as of no Authority, and thoſe Perſons as no Biſhops: But *Le Quien* likes it better to make him an *Evidence* that they were not *in fact* ordained, either by thoſe Perſons or by that Form. He puts the Words *Ils ne reçûrent aucune Ordination,* in the *Italick* Letter, that the Reader may not miſs obſerving that they are very home and deciſive to his Purpoſe; But it would be more to his Reputation, not to leave out or miſ-tranſlate the Author's Words, to make him ſpeak the Senſe of his Interpreter and not his own.

4. The Author could not well be more plain and expreſs, than he is when he ſays, That our Prelates *had not three nor two Biſhops, or one Metropolitan, of their own Sect, conſecrated before by other Biſhops, by whoſe Conſent and Impoſition of Hands they might be conſecrated.* And he ſays this in conſequence of what he had ſaid juſt before the Law required, *That with the Conſent of the Metropolitan two or three Biſhops ſhould lay Hands upon them:* For the want of which, he charges them with having *no lawful Ordination.* But this is not

[i] Pag. 269. [k] T. 1. Addit. p. iii.

enough

enough to ſatisfy *Le Quien*, without making him ſay (as *Fitz-Simon* [l] does after him, but is obliged to correct himſelf) that they had *not three, nor two, nor one* Biſhop *in all* England. In his Verſion (it happens) he ſays only, *they had not any Metropolitan of their Sect*; but both before and after it he gives us this Account as from *Sanders*, that they had not ſo much as one Biſhop [m], *That they found no Body to ordain them, but took Poſſeſſion of their Sees without having received any Conſecration:* That [n] *it was notorious that they were placed in their Sees without receiving any Ordination or Impoſition of Hands from any Biſhop*; and That *the Proteſtants had not any Biſhop of their Sect who could lay Hands upon them, for want of having themſelves received any Ordination.* If the Author's own Words were to be his Warrant for what he pretends to make him ſay, how can he offer to make us believe, that his ſaying they had not *three nor two*, is the ſame as if he had ſaid they *found no Body, not ſo much as one?* We ſhall ſoon meet with another Inſtance of his Fidelity and Exactneſs in citing and tranſlating his Author, when we come to his Account from *Champney* of the *Nag's-Head* Ordination.

5. How far *Sanders* is uncapable to be brought for a Witneſs of the Truth of that Story, will appear when I come to examine what he ſays in the Paſſages which I have tranſlated out of his Work: At preſent I ſhall proceed to tranſlate, or copy out, for the Reader, the Relation of the Fact in the other Writers that have raiſed the fine Superſtructure upon his Foundation. The firſt is *Conſtable*, in a MS. referred to firſt by *Fitz-Simon* [o]; and afterwards by *Kelliſon* [p], under the

The Account of the Nag's-Head *Story in* Conſtable's *MS.*

[l] Infr. p. 11. [m] P. 309. [n] P. 313.
[o] Britannomachia Miniſtrorum, p. 320. [p] Examen Novæ Reformationis, p. 166.

Title of, *An Anſwer to a Queſtion about the Vocation and Conſecration of the ENGLISH Biſhops*; which Relation *Kelliſon* ſays *Conſtable* gives from *Stow*, who often uſed to tell it to the Catholicks, of whom ſome were yet alive, tho' he durſt not put it into his Chronicle. The Story from *Conſtable*'s MS. we have in *Champney* [q], in theſe Words as I tranſlate him, "*Parker* was ordained by two "Heretick Prieſts at the moſt, and not by Bi-"ſhops, ſuppoſing that *Barlow* aſſiſted *Scory* in "the Action, of which I am ignorant. For the "Old Biſhop of *Landaff*, who was brought to "the Place deſigned for the Conſecration of "*Parker* and the reſt, pretended that his Sight "failed him, that he might not be guilty of ſo "profane an Action. Whence it followed that "they applied themſelves to *Scory*, whom they "had not thought of before. Which Account "is atteſted not only by Catholicks of very good "Reputation (*integerrimæ fidei*) who were Eye-"Witneſſes of what was done, but alſo even by "*John Stow*, who throughly ſearched with all "Diligence into the Circumſtances of the Fact, "tho' he durſt not relate them in his Chronicle."

Sacroboſco's *Relation.*

6. The next Author is *Holywood* or *Sacroboſco*. The Subject he is treating of, which gave him occaſion to tell the Story, is, [r] *Whether a Parliamentary Congregation is a True Church.* And his ſecond Argument for the negative, is, becauſe the *Parliamentary Paſtors have no Orders.* And that he proves, Firſt, by referring to what *Campian*, *Duræus* and *Sanders* ſay to that Purpoſe. Secondly, from the *Original of our Miniſtry*, which he ſays was this, (his Words I ſhall render

[q] De Vocatione Miniſtrorum, p. 501, 502. Le Quien, T. 1. p. 194. Remarks on F. Le Courayer, p. 172.

[r] De inveſtigandâ Chriſti Eccleſiâ. c. 4.

into

into *Engliſh*) " In [s] the beginning of Q. *Eliza-*
" *beth*'s Reign the Biſhops of the *Sectaries* were
" to be made. They that wanted Ordination
" *(Candidati)* met at *London*, at an Inn in the
" Street called *Cheapſide*, at the Sign of the *Nag's-*
" *Head*, and together with them came the old
" ſimple Biſhop of *Landaffe*, (*Laudaſenſis*, as it
" is in the *Latin* all along) to give them Orders.
" Which as ſoon as *Bonner* (*Bomerus*) then Dean
" of the Biſhops in *England*, came to underſtand,
" he ſent his Chaplain from the Tower (where he
" was impriſoned for his Religion) to command
" *Landaff*, under Pain of Excommunication, not
" to ordain the New Biſhops. By which Menace
" *Landaff* being frightened drew back, and ma-
" king uſe of many Pretences avoided the ſacri-
" legious Ordination. Hereupon the Perſons
" waiting for Orders *(Candidati)* began to be in
" a great Rage, to abuſe *Landaff*, and to con-
" ſider of taking new Meaſures. To ſay no
" more, *Scory* the Monk, afterwards the Mock-
" Biſhop of *Hereford*, impoſes Hands upon the
" reſt, and ſome of them impoſe Hands upon
" *Scory*, and ſo the Children are born without a
" Father, and the Father is begotten by the
" Children, a Thing never heard of in any Age
" before. This *Thomas Neale*, Reader of the *He-*
" *brew* Tongue at *Oxford*, who was preſent, re-
" lated to the old Confeſſors for Religion, and
" they to me. And the Story is confirmed by
" its being afterwards enacted in Parliament that
" theſe Parliamentary Prelates ſhould be eſteem-
" ed lawful Biſhops."

7. The next after *Sacroboſco* is the Prefacer to *F. Parſon's Diſcuſſion* of Biſhop *Barlow's Anſwer* *Relation of the Prefacer to Parſons's Diſcuſſion,*

[s] Sacroboſco, c. 4. Maſon of the Conſecration of the Biſhops in the Church of England, p. 268. Append. Id. Vindiciæ Eccleſ. Anglicanæ, p. 678.

to

to a Nameleſſe Catholick. Their Writers generally make the Relation not the Prefacer's, but *Parſons*'s own. But the Title Page might have prevented their Miſtake, and the Book might have ſhewed them that the Author did not live to go ſo far in *Barlow*'s Anſwer, as that Paſſage which gave the Prefacer an Handle to charge *Jewell* and others of our Biſhops with ſuch a Conſecration. *Barlow* in his Anſwer reflects upon *Parſons*'s naming Mr. *Jewell* without condeſcending to give him his Title of Biſhop, in theſe Words, [t] *Sure he was as lawful a Biſhop as* Bellarmine *was a Cardinal.* To this the Prefacer replies, [u] "Of *Bellarmine*'s being a Cardinal there can be no doubt, "ſeeing he was made by the Pope—— But [x] of "Mr. *Jewell*'s being Biſhop we have not ſo much "certainty, yea we have no certainty at all. For "who I pray you made him? Who gave him his "Juriſdiction? Who impoſed Hands upon him? "What Orders had they? What Biſhops were "they? [y] True it is that both he, *Sands*, *Scory*, "*Horne*, *Grindall*, and others (*if I miſtake not their* "*Names*) in the beginning of the Reign of Q. *Eliza-*"*beth*, met at the *Horſe-Head* in *Cheapſide* (a "fit Sign for ſuch a Sacrament) and being diſappointed of the Catholick Biſhop of *Landaff* "who ſhould there have come to conſecrate them, "they uſed the like Art that the *Lollards* once "did in another Matter, who being deſirous to "eat Fleſh on *Good Friday*, and yet fearing the "Penalties of the Laws in ſuch Caſes appointed, "took a Pig and diving him under the Water, "ſaid, *Down Pig up Pike*, and then after con-"ſtantly avouched that they had eaten no Fleſh "but Fiſh. So I ſay theſe grave Prelates aſ-"ſembled as aforeſaid, ſeeing the Biſhop whom

[t] Anſwer to a nameleſs Catholick, p. 326. [u] N. 135.
[x] Maſon of the Conſecration, &c. p. 267. Vindiciæ, p. 677. [y] N. 136.

" they expected came not to conſecrate them,
" they dealt with *Scory* of *Hereford* to do it, who
" when they were all on their Knees, cauſed him,
" who kneeled down, *John Jewell*, to riſe up Bi-
" ſhop of *Salisbury*, and him that was *Robert*
" *Horne* before, to riſe up Biſhop of *Wincheſter*,
" and ſo forth with all the reſt. Which *Horſe-*
" *Head* Ordering was after confirmed ſynodi-
" cally by Parliament; wherein they were ac-
" knowledged for true Biſhops, and it was far-
" ther enacted, that none ſhould make any doubt
" or call in queſtion that Ordination. [z] This
" was the firſt Ordering of Mr. *Jewell* and
" the reſt, as I have been informed by one that
" heard it from Mr. *Neale*, Reader of the *He-*
" *brew* Lecture in *Oxford*, who was there preſent,
" and an Eye-Witneſs of what was done and
" paſſed."

Fitz-Simon's *Relation.*

8. The next is *Fitz-Simon* in his *Britanno-machia Miniſtrorum.* His Words, as I tranſlate them from the *Latin*, are, [a] " When Religion was
" to be totally altered by Q. *Elizabeth*, the true
" Biſhops either being fled whitherſoever they
" could, or committed to Priſon, ſeveral hungry
" ſacrilegious Men gaped after the vacant Pre-
" ferments, and the Queen was inclined to give
" them to ſuch of thoſe Perſons who appeared
" for them, as could at leaſt have ſome Shew of
" Epiſcopal Conſecration. By the Law of the
" Land, conformably to the Canon Law, three
" Biſhops are required to conſecrate a Biſhop,
" and without that Number none is looked
" upon to be duly conſecrated. But [b] at this
" time there were not three, nor two, nor one
" Biſhop in all *England* (as the Authors I have
" before referred to affirm) that could and would
" conſecrate the others." To abridge what fol-

[z] N. 137. [a] P. 318. [b] P. 319.

lows,

lows till he proceeds in the Story, *Maſon*, he ſays, enquires what could hinder thoſe from being accounted Biſhops who were conſecrated under K. *Edward*; and perplexes himſelf about the Objections of Hereſy, Want of the Character, and other things; but that he, in pity to the poor Man, has before ſignified to him another great Impediment beſides (which he had not Eyes to ſee, tho' as clear as the Sun at Noon-day) the Want of a true Form of Ordination under K. *Edward*, and of an Intention both in the Conſecrators, and Perſons conſecrated to do what the Church does, both of them expreſly and ſolemnly declaring that they renounced and abhorred the true Prieſthood and Sacrifice, *&c.* Then he goes on, " That tho' he ſaid there was not one that " would be guilty of the ſacrilegious Attempt " of conſecrating the Proteſtant Biſhops, yet he " was aware that one *Engliſh* Biſhop, the meaneſt " of them for Wiſdom and Learning, *Anthony* " *Kitchin* Biſhop of *Landaff*, turned over to the " Reformers: [c] But even he, tho' commiſſioned in " the firſt place by Q. *Elizabeth*, was ſo far from " executing that wicked Commiſſion (whether " being frightned by *Bonner*'s Threatning, or of " himſelf abhorring ſo profane an Action) that " he pretended himſelf to be blind, and conſe- " quently unable to perform the Office. Which " he ſays *Stow* the Chronicler confeſſed upon all " Occaſions, tho' he durſt not publiſh it in his " Hiſtory for fear of being put out of the Sy- " nagogue.

" There was at that time an *Iriſh* Archbiſhop " Priſoner in the Tower, whom, with a Promiſe " of his Liberty and a good Reward, they humbly " requeſted to take pity of the Church in her " great want of Miniſters, and to perform the

[c] P. 329.

" Ordina-

" Ordination. But the good Man (as *Sanders*
" ſays) could not be prevailed upon by any means
" to lay his holy Hands upon Hereticks, and to
" be Partaker of other Mens Sins." Then, after giving us his Conjecture what Biſhop this was, he ſays, " Whoever he was he refuſed this profane
" Office to his eternal Honour. —— And they
" having in vain tried ſo many ways of gratifying
" their own haſty Ambition, when no other Re-
" medy offer'd itſelf, they themſelves meet to-
" gether on a Day agreed upon, *A.* 1559. at the
" *Nag's-Head* or *Horſe-Head* Tavern in the chief
" Street in *London*, *Cheapſide*." After ſome Reflections upon the Scandalouſneſs of the Place, and the Confuſion they were in, which made them neglect all the Solemnities of Religion in the Ordination; he ſays, [d] " That they reſolved to go on
" to (the Ἐπίτασις) the main Part of the Comedy,
" and to finiſh the Work they had entered upon
" in an haſty diſorderly Manner. Out of the
" Company they made choice of *Scory* an apoſtate
" Monk——*Junius* ſays (but with the Religion
" of a *Calviniſt*) that in the Church Impoſition of
" Hands was antiently nothing more but a friend-
" ly taking the Perſon by the Hand. *Scory* ha-
" ving this Reflection in his Head, bids them all
" fall down upon their Knees, and then taking
" *Parker* by the Hand, ſays, Up! riſe Lord
" Biſhop of *Canterbury*: And again in like man-
" ner to *Grindall*, Up! riſe Lord Biſhop of *London*:
" So to *Horn*, Up! riſe Lord Biſhop of *Wincheſter*;
" and then to *Sands*, Up! riſe Lord Biſhop of
" *Worceſter*, and ſo of the reſt —— But this was
" not (the Καταστροφὴ) the end of the Play, which it
" is of great Importance not to conceal; for it was
" not fit that our unhappy *Iſchyras* ſhould return
" from the Tavern unrewarded, but ſhould for

[d] P. 321.

" this,

" this worthy Action be promoted to the Bi-
" ſhoprick of *Hereford*. But who could give it
" to the ambitious Apoſtate? You need not aſk
" that Queſtion: In ſuch an irregular Ordination
" no wonder if by a ſtrange Prodigy the Father
" be begotten by one of his Sons. For that it
" was ſo in fact, *Thomas Neal*, an Eye-witneſs of
" the whole Mock-Conſecration (which he came
" from *Oxford* on purpoſe to ſee) declared both
" to *Thomas Haberley*, a pious, grave, and re-
" verend old Man, now living in the *Netherlands*,
" and to many others."

Wadſworth's *Account.*

9. The next Writer, *Wadſworth*, ſays but little, yet enough to ſhew that the others that tell the whole Story cannot much be depended upon. It is in a Letter dated *Ap.* 1. 1615. from *Sevil* in *Spain*, publiſhed, *A.* 1624. by Biſhop *Bedell*, then Mr. *Bedell*, to whom it was writ, with ſeveral others of his and Mr. *Bedell*'s Letters under the Title of *Copies of certain Letters— Between James Wadſworth and William Bedell.* The Words in his firſt Letter are, [c] " Whereas the Councils
" require three Biſhops to aſſiſt at the Conſecra-
" tion of a Biſhop, it is certain that at the *Nag's-*
" *Head* in *Cheapſide*, where Conſecration of your
" Biſhops was attempted but not effected (where-
" about I remember the Controverſy you had
" with one) there was but one Biſhop, and I am
" ſure there was ſuch a Matter: And although I
" know and have ſeen the Records themſelves,
" that afterward there was a Conſecration of Dr.
" *Parker* at *Lambeth*, and three Biſhops named,
" *viz. Miles Coverdall* of *Exeter*, one *Hodgskin*
" *Suffragan* of *Bedford*, and another whoſe Name
" I have forgotten, yet it is very doubtful, that
" *Coverdall* being made Biſhop of *Exeter* in King
" *Edward*'s Time (when all Councils and Church

[c] N. 11. p. 12.

" Canons

" Canons were little obſerved) he was never him-
" ſelf canonically conſecrated, and ſo if he were
" no Canonical Biſhop, he could not make ano-
" ther Canonical: And the third unnamed, as I
" remember (but am not ſure) was only a *Biſhop*
" *Elect* and not conſecrated, and ſo was not ſuf-
" ficient. But hereof I am ſure, that they did
" conſecrate *Parker* by vertue of a *Breve* from
" the Queen as Head of the Church, *&c.*" as he goes on to object againſt that Conſecration which he allows to have been *effected.*

10. The next, *Kelliſon*, relates the Story in his *Examen novæ Reformationis*, that Part of which I ſhall tranſlate from the *Latin*. How little he knew of the pretended Fact when he firſt publiſhed his *Engliſh Survey of the New Religion*, An. 1603. and reprinted it two Years after, and when he replied to *Sutcliffe*'s Anſwer, *A.* 1608. will appear afterwards. But in this *Latin* Work, *A.* 1616. he takes himſelf to be ſufficiently inſtructed to ſet forth a Narrative of the Conſecration. He firſt [f] gives Reaſons why none of the Catholick Prelates would or could have ordained Queen *Elizabeth*'s new Biſhops. And " thereupon, he ſays, " they were obliged (whatever *Maſon* prates to the " contrary) to wait upon an *Iriſh* Arch-biſhop, " then Priſoner in the Tower, and with many " Intreaties and Offers of great Rewards, to de-" ſire him to lay Hands upon them." For this he refers us to *Sanders*, but then leaving him (to tell from other Hands the reſt of the Story, till he comes back to *Sanders* again) he ſays, " That " Biſhop refuſing, they were forced to requeſt " *Scory*'s Help and Aſſiſtance, which otherwiſe " they had not deſired, becauſe they knew him " to be only a titular Biſhop, and unlawfully " made in K. *Edward*'s time. So, he ſays, *Con-* Kelliſon's *Relation.*

[f] P. 165.

" *ſtable*

" *ſtable* relates it from *Stow* g, who tho' he durſt " not put it into his Chronicle, yet uſed often to " tell it to the Catholicks, of whom ſome are " yet alive. Many others, worthy of all Cre- " dit, have related the ſame; and one *Thomas* " *Neale*, Profeſſor of *Hebrew* in the Univerſity " of *Oxford*, who alſo himſelf was an Eye-Wit- " neſs, uſed to declare to many Perſons (whereof " ſome are yet living) that this Conſecration of " the firſt Mock-Biſhops under Q. *Elizabeth* " was in a Tavern in *London*, at the *Nag's-Head* " in *Cheapſide*; a fit Church for ſuch a Conſe- " cration. So, he ſays, alſo *Sacroboſco* relates it." Then he takes up *Sanders* again, from whom he could have no more than the Introduction (about their wanting the legal Number of Biſhops to conſecrate them, and the *Iriſh* Archbiſhop's refuſing to do it) and the Concluſion, which now follows. " And becauſe they were ſenſible that " they were not conſecrated according to the Sta- " tute 25 *Hen.* VIII. which requires that a Bi- " ſhop be not conſecrated but by three Biſhops, " with the Conſent of the Metropolitan; and be- " ſides, that a Rumour was ſpread abroad that " they were not rightly-ordained Biſhops, they " were forced (as he expreſſes it in *Sanders*'s " Words) to call for the Aſſiſtance of the ſecu- " lar Arm, that they might in a following Par- " liament be confirmed by the Lay-Power, *&c.*"

Champney's *Relation.*

11. From *Kelliſon*, we are to paſs to *Anthony Champney*, Doctor of the *Sorbonne*, who had the laſt hand in methodizing, dreſſing up, and poliſhing the Story. His Words in his Book in *Latin*, *De vocatione Miniſtrorum*, I ſhall tranſlate, and likewiſe ſet down, where it is material, what he ſays in his *Engliſh* Treatiſe *Of the Vocation of Biſhops*, publiſhed two Years before, h " In the

g P. 166. h Ch. 14. p. 497.

" begin-

" beginning of Q. *Elizabeth*'s Reign, the Ca-
" tholick Biſhops being deprived and committed
" to Priſon (as will be ſeen afterwards) others
" were to be made and placed in their Sees.
" They who were nominated and elected to that
" Dignity met by Appointment in *London*, at an
" Inn (*Hoſpitio*) at the Sign of the *Nag's-Head*,
" in the Street called *Cheapſide*. Thither alſo
" came, upon Invitation, the Biſhop of *Landaff*,
" very ancient and decrepit, and a weak and ti-
" morous Man. By him the new Candidates
" expected to be ordained. Which *Bonner*
" Biſhop of *London*, " [i] Which being known
" then in Priſon for Re- " to *Bonner*, then Pri-
" ligion, having ſome " ſoner, he ſent unto
" Intimation of, (*ſubol-* " the Biſhop of *Landaff*
" *faciens*) threatned " forbidding him, un-
" *Landaff* with excom- " der Pain of Excom-
" munication if he or- " munication, to exer-
" dained them. He " ciſe any ſuch Power
" being frightned with " in his Dioceſe as to
" this Meſſage, and be- " order theſe Men."
" ing alſo poſſibly touched with the Checks and
" Pricks of his own Conſcience, drew back,
" and pretending that his Eyes were too weak,
" refuſed to lay Hands upon them. The *Ex-*
" *pectants* therefore being diſappointed of what
" they hoped for, and looking upon it as his
" putting a Trick and Abuſe upon them, began
" to load the Old Man with Reproaches, whom
" before they had treated with great Honour
" and Reſpect; ſome of them ſaying, This
" doating old Fool thinks we ſhall not be Bi-
" ſhops except we be *greaſed*; ridiculing both
" the Aged Biſhop, and the Catholick Ce-
" remony of Conſecration. [k] But being thus
" diſappointed of a Conſecrator, they were

[i] Engl. p. 194. [k] P. 498.

" forced to take new Meaſures, and addreſ-
" ſed themſelves to *Scory*, an apoſtate Monk,
" who having borrow- " who under *Edw.* VI.
" ed the Name of Bi- " had, without any
" ſhop in K. *Edward*'s " Conſecration, (as will
" time, was thought " ſoon appear) unlaw-
" to have ſufficient " fully poſſeſſed him-
" Power to perform " ſelf of a Biſhoprick,
" the Office, eſpecially " to be ordain'd by him.
" in ſuch a ſtraight " He who with his reli-
" Neceſſity—— " gious Habit had laid
" aſide all Conſcience,
" ſoon did the Buſineſs,
" making uſe of this
" Having the Bible in " Ceremony. They
" his Hand, and they " all kneeling before
" all kneeling before " him he laid the Bible
" him, he laid it upon " upon each of their
" every one of their " Heads, and ſaid, *Take*
" Heads or Shoulders, " *thou Authority to preach*
" ſaying, *Take thou Au-* " *the Word of God ſin-*
" *thority to preach the* " *cerely*. And ſo they
" *Word of God ſincerely*. " roſe up all Biſhops.
" And ſo they roſe " This whole Relation
" up Biſhops. This " I had more than once
" whole Narration, " from the Mouth of a
" without adding or " Reverend Prieſt, Mr.
" detracting any Word " *Thomas Bluett*, a very
" pertaining to the " grave, learned, and
" Subſtance of the Mat- " prudent Man, who
" ter, *&c.* " ſaid he heard it from
" Mr. *Neal*, a Perſon
" of great Reputation
" and Learning, for-
" Sometimes Reader of " merly Profeſſor of
" the *Hebrew* or *Greek* " the *Hebrew* Tongue
" Lecture in *Oxford*, " in the Univerſity of
" but when this Matter " *Oxford*, and at the
" paſſed was belonging " time when all this

" to " was

" to *Bonner*, and ſent by " him to deliver the " Meſſage before-men- " tioned to the Biſhop " of *Landaff*, and with- " al to attend there to " ſee the End of the " Buſineſs. Mr. *Blu-* " *ett* had other good " Means to be inform- " ed of this Matter, " being a long time " Priſoner with Dr. " *Watſon* Biſhop of *Lin-* " *coln*, and other Men " of Note of the an- " cient Clergy, in whoſe " Time and in whoſe " Sight, as a Man may " ſay, this Matter was " done. " was done, of *Bonner* " the Biſhop of *London*'s " Family, who ſent him " to the Biſhop of *Lan-* " *daff*, to require him, " under pain of Excom- " munication, not to " proceed in that ſacri- " legious Conſecration; " and beſides to ſee " what was done there, " ſo that he was an " Eye-witneſs of what " was done. And of " the Truth of this Re- " lation there are at this " day as many Witneſ- " ſes as are alive of the " Prieſts who were Pri- " ſoners with *Bluett* in " the Caſtle of *Wisbich*, " in which Place alſo " I had it from him. "

12. Here the Reader has a View of the whole Legend, from the firſt Ground-work of it in *Sanders*, till it came to its full Height and Proportion in *Fitz-Simon* and *Champney*. From the Narrative of the latter F. *Le Quien* takes the [l] *Relation* (as he calls it) of his *Catholick Writers*; as, half a Century before him, the Author of the [m] *Treatiſe of Catholick Faith and Hereſy* takes his Account from *Champney*. He gives us almoſt *Champney*'s own Words, with very little Variation: but *Le Quien* allows himſelf greater Liberty, as would appear if (as he does in *Sanders*'s Caſe) after his Tranſlation and Paraphraſe of

[l] T. 1. p. 184. [m] P. 7, 8.

Champney in *French*, he had ſet down the *Latin* Text of the Author. I ſhall at preſent only take notice of one ſtrange and bold Variation, *viz.* That, in the Concluſion, after [n] *Scory*'s Form, *Take thou Authority to preach the Word of God ſincerely*, he leaves out *Champney*'s Words immediately following, *Et ſic ſurrexerunt omnes Epiſcopi*; *and ſo they roſe up all Biſhops*; and inſtead of them goes on thus (without almoſt ſo much as any Diſtinction of Points) to ſhew that it is a new Story: "And taking them one after another by the "Hand, as giving them that which the *Calviniſts* "call *The Right-Hand of Fellowſhip*, he ſaid firſt "to *Parker*, Riſe up my Lord Archbiſhop of "*Canterbury*; then to *Edmund Grindall*, Riſe up "my Lord Biſhop of *London*; to *Robert Horn*, "Riſe up my Lord Biſhop of *Wincheſter*; to "*Edwin Sands*, Riſe up my Lord Biſhop of "*Worceſter:* And the ſame to all the reſt of the "Prelates who were there for the ſame Purpoſe." Then *Le Quien* tells us immediately in the next Words, "This Hiſtory, ſuch as I have juſt now "related, is to be found in the Book of *Anthony* "*Champney*, Doctor of the *Sorbonne*, *De Voca*-"*tione Miniſtrorum*, *c.* 14. *p.* 497."

LeQuien's *Addition to* Champney *as part of his Narrative taken almoſt* verbatim *out of* Fitz-Simon.

13. If the *Father* has an Edition of *Champney*'s Book, contrived, notwithſtanding this Addition, to anſwer exactly the very ſame Pages in the Edition that I have, he knows beſt: But in this Edition the Reader, if he pleaſes to conſult it, may pore his Eyes out before he will find this Clauſe added to *Champney*'s Story. So that if there be no ſuch Edition, it muſt be an Interpolation of *Le Quien*'s own making, for Reaſons beſt known to himſelf. It may be ſaid that his Account from *Champney* all along is a kind of Paraphraſe, and

[n] T. 1, p. 187, 188.

this

this Addition is only an Enlargement inſtead of thoſe Words, *And ſo they roſe up all Biſhops.* If it be a Paraphraſe, it is ſuch an one as we have ordinarily in Romances, where the Authors ſhew their Skill in drawing out a Story to a great Length, by multiplying and accumulating Circumſtances which are not in the real Hiſtory; as here it appears, that when *Scory* had pronounced the Form, and nothing of Prayers or Bleſſing followed in the Ceremony, as they give it us, the Biſhops conſecrated had nothing to do but to riſe up preſently, without waiting for *Scory* to lend them an helping hand. But this Paraphraſe has ſomething very ſingular in it; that notwithſtanding the whole Narration is declared by *Le Quien* to belong to *Champney*, yet this Part of it ſtands almoſt Word for Word in another Author, *Fitz-Simon*, one who writ four Years before *Champney* printed his Work in *Latin*, *De Vocatione Miniſtrorum*, and cannot be ſuppoſed to write an Expoſition upon an Author that was to come after him. For what Purpoſe the *Father robs* Fitz-Simon *to pay* Champney, that is, takes this Supplement from the former to make up the Deficiency in the latter, I cannot conceive; except that having theſe two Writers both before him, he could not but ſee that there is a plain Difference and Inconſiſtency between the two Relations, as they ſtand apart, in the *Iriſh* Jeſuit and the Doctor of the *Sorbonne*; as the Reader himſelf will ſee clearly, if he compares the two Paſſages, ſet one againſt the other.

Fitz-Simon, *p.* 321. *ſup.* *p.* 13.	*Champney*, *p.* 498. *ſup.* *p.* 18.
" They make choice	" They addreſſed
" of *Scory*, an apoſtate	" themſelves to *Scory*,
" Monk— He bids	" an apoſtate Monk.
" them	" —to

" them all fall down up-
" on their Knees; then
" taking *Parker* by the
" Hand, he ſays, Up!
" Riſe Lord Biſhop of
" *Canterbury*; and a-
" gain in like manner
" to *Grindall*, Up! Riſe
" Lord Biſhop of *Lon-*
" *don*; and ſo to *Horn*,
" Up! Riſe Lord Bi-
" ſhop of *Wincheſter*;
" and then to *Sands*,
" Up! Riſe Lord Bi-
" ſhop of *Worceſter*:
" And ſo to the reſt."

" —to be ordained by
" him. He ſoon did
" the Buſineſs, uſing
" this Ceremony. They
" all kneeling before
" him, he laid the Bi-
" ble upon the Heads
" of every one of them,
" and ſaid, Take thou
" Authority to preach
" the Word of God ſin-
" cerely. And ſo they
" roſe up all Biſhops."

14. Any one that looks upon theſe two different Columns, and the Paſſages in them, as they ſtand apart, may ſee that *Champney* and *Fitz-Simon* (in whoſe Words the Addition which *Le Quien* makes to *Champney* is drawn up) diſagree with one another in that which is of the greateſt Importance in an Ordination, the two eſſential Parts of it, the Matter and the Form. The Matter in the one is, laying the Bible upon their Heads; in the other, *Junius*'s *Calviniſtical* Impoſition of Hands, by giving the Right Hand of Fellowſhip to the Perſon conſecrated. The Form in the one is, Take thou Authority to preach the Word of God ſincerely; in the other, Up! Riſe Lord Biſhop of *Canterbury*; Up! Riſe Lord Biſhop of *London*, *&c.* If there be any thing that can be looked upon as intended by theſe two Writers for the Subſtance of the Ordination, it muſt be in the Paſſages above, as they each of them contain the Matter and Form, related by the one with ſome regard to the Rules and Practice of the *Roman* Church; and by the other agreeably to the *Calviniſtical*

viniſtical Principles, which he takes to be the Principles of the Church of *England*; but both of them plainly intimate that the Ceremony they are relating in this different Manner is the very Subſtance of the Ordination. *Champney* expreſſes it, *Scory* ſoon did the *Buſineſs*, uſing this Ceremony. *Fitz-Simon* makes it, the Ἐπίτασις, the main Part of the Comedy. And if there be a ſubſtantial Difference between theſe two Accounts of the Ceremony, then we muſt ſay the Story of the *Nag's-Head* Ordination, as it is delivered by theſe two Authors, is in the very main Part, the Subſtance of the Ordination, different from and inconſiſtent with itſelf; and we may ſay this with good Authority, becauſe we may vouch *Le Quien* for it; who when he writ knew what he did, and had the Sagacity to obſerve the Diſagreement between *Fitz-Simon* and *Champney*, and to find out an Expedient to reconcile them, by placing the Paſſage in the firſt cloſe to the End of that in the other, that ſo it might, firſt, appear to be one continued Relation, and not two different Stories: And the Addition, ſecondly, from *Fitz-Simon* under *Champney* might be conceived not to belong to the Subſtance of the Ordination, but to be purely ceremonial; as the Mitre, Staff, and placing the Biſhop in the Epiſcopal Chair, with the Words annexed in the *Roman* Pontifical, are only additional Ceremonies, after the laying the Bible upon the Head and Shoulders of the Biſhop elect, and the Impoſition of Biſhop's Hands, and the Unction, with the proper Forms of Words adapted to them, which make the eſſential Matter and Form.

There is no other Writer, that I know of, who takes this Method of piecing up the Story, but the Poet ° *Thomas Ward*, *Canto* the ſecond, who puts the raiſing up the Biſhops by *Scory* immediately after his pronouncing the Form, *Take thou*

Authority, &c. and if this Author, ſo well known to *Le Quien*, gave him the Hint, it is very much for the *Father*'s Honour. However, he acts more fairly than *Le Quien*, for he cites two Authors in the Margin to anſwer each Part; *Champney* for laying the Bible upon the Heads and Shoulders of the Biſhops, with the Form abovementioned, and F. *Parſons* (whom he takes to be the ſame with his *Prefacer*) for the other Part, the *raiſing them up, and hailing them Biſhops*; whereas *Le Quien* gives both Parts wholly to *Champney*, and declares that the whole is to be read in him. *Ward*, being a Poet, may be better allowed than *Le Quien* to add what he pleaſes of his own, by way of Paraphraſe; and one of his handſome Reflections is upon *Scory*'s laying the Bible upon their Shoulders, [p] "That the Bible is the Food of "the Proteſtants, and therefore their Paſtors "ought to carry the Food of their Flocks upon "their Backs." So audaciouſly can a wretched Buffoon take upon him to ſhew his Wit, in a profane and blaſphemous Abuſe of the holy Scripture; for this Reaſon, becauſe our Church allows the Laity the Uſe of the Bible in their own Tongue; and this, tho' the Jeſt and Drollery is as plain and direct an Abuſe of the *Roman* Pontifical, which orders the Bible to be laid upon the Head and Shoulders of the Biſhop to be conſecrated. Except their Church will tell us that the Bible is not the Food of thoſe that are under their Paſtors, who give them little of the holy Scripture, unleſs it be in a Tongue they do not underſtand, but feed them rather with the Milk of their own Legends and Traditions.

But I am led out of my way by following *Le Quien*, the proper time to expoſe the Differences and Inconſiſtencies of the Writers of the *Nag's-*

[o] P. 161. Edit. 1716. [p] Ibid.

Head

Head Fable, being not till when I come to consider the Authors themſelves, and compare them together. However, I could not paſs by *Le Quien*'s Management, neither here nor before, when I was upon his Tranſlation of *Sanders:* And I cannot but reflect upon it, that it muſt be either with Deſign and Artifice, or from a very ſtrange Want of Care and Exactneſs, that he thus happens to miſrepreſent the Authors, whom he pretends to lay before the Reader. It will be the leſs Surprize to us, to find him as ready to impoſe upon us, in his Way of arguing from the Authors he produces, as we ſhall preſently ſee he does in *Sanders*'s Caſe.

CHAP.

CHAP. II.

Reflections upon Sanders. *What he is pretended to ſay by* Le Quien *and the Author of* Remarks on F. Le Courayer. *Diſproof of what this Author pretends to make him ſay. Diſproof of what* Le Quien *pretends to infer from his Words. Reflections upon what* Sanders *ſays of the Want of a Metropolitan. Confutation of what he ſays that the Proteſtants had not three Biſhops. Falſe, that they had no Biſhops conſecrated before by other Biſhops. Falſe, that they attempted to be conſecrated by an* Iriſh *Arch-Biſhop. Reflections upon what he ſays of their being confirmed in a following Parliament. Of what Credit he ought to be eſteemed. The* Nag's-Head *Fable diſproved by his being utterly ignorant of any ſuch Fact.* Le Quien's *and the* Remarker's *frivolous Reaſons why he might be informed of the Story, and yet not ſpeak a Word of it.*

Reflections upon Sanders.

1. I come now to conſider the ſeveral Authors whom I have before tranſcribed or tranſlated. The firſt is *Sanders*, in his laſt Work, *Of the* Engliſh *Schiſm*, which he left behind him, *Anno* 1581; at which time he died in *Ireland*, after he had been for two Years in open Rebellion againſt his Sovereign Q. *Elizabeth*; and had, in the Year 1580. writ [q] *A Perſuaſive to the Catholick Lords and Gentlemen of* Ireland, to riſe up in Arms againſt the Queen, under the Banner of the

[q] Strype's Life of Matth. Parker, Append. B. 4. p. 119.

Pope's

Pope's Lieutenant: And at laſt, when he met with no better Succeſs than he deſerved, in his malicious and treaſonable Attempts, had fallen into Diſtraction, and brought upon himſelf the miſerable End of being ſtarved to Death, as he wandered about in deſolate Places, and found no Succour or Relief. A juſt Puniſhment from the Divine Juſtice upon him, *That his Mouth ſhould be thus cloſed up*, (as *Camden*[r] obſerves when he ſpeaks of his Death) *which was always open to ſound a Trumpet to Rebellion, and maliciouſly to utter Lies and Slanders.*

2. Such an Author, it appears, deſerves but little Credit to be given to whatever he ſays. But I ſhall firſt do him that Juſtice as to ſhew a little farther, how F. *Le Quien* and another Writer attempt to make him ſay more than he does. Secondly, I ſhall ſhew, wherein he is guilty either of Ignorance or Falſhood, in that which he does really ſay: And proceed to ſhew, Thirdly, of how little Credit he ought to be eſteemed. Fourthly, that he was utterly ignorant of any ſuch Fact as the Ordination at the *Nag's-Head*. Laſtly, that the Reaſons of *Le Quien* and the other Writer, why it might be well known to him, and yet he might not ſpeak a Word of it, are weak and frivolous.

What Sanders *is pretended to ſay by* Le Quien *and the Author of* Remarks *on F.* Le Courayer.

For the firſt, *Le Quien*, at his very Entrance upon his Verſion of the Author, beſpeaks his Reader, [f] *See*, ſays he, *how* Sanders *reports the Fact which was the Occaſion of their being made the laughing Stock of ſo many Perſons.* The Reader, at firſt, muſt be under an Expectation that the following *Report* in the Author is of the *ridiculous* Ordination at the *Nag's-Head*; that this muſt be the *Fact* which expoſed our Biſhops to the *Mockery and*

[r] Annal. Eliz. l. 3. Ann. 1583. [f] T. 1. p. 310.

Deriſion

Deriſion of the Catholicks. But if he looks back to my Tranſlation of that Part of *Sanders*, or compares it with *Le Quien*'s Verſion and Extract, does he find either in the one or the other a *Report* of our Biſhops being conſecrated at that Tavern? Is the Author's ſaying they had not *three or two Biſhops* to conſecrate them, that they were *deſtitute of all lawful Ordination*, that they took and kept their Sees *without any Epiſcopal Conſecration*, is this the ſame as if he had ſaid they were made Biſhops by that *Mock-Conſecration? Le Quien* himſelf owns the contrary. [t] *It is true*, ſays he, *that* Sanders *does not expreſly ſpeak of the Hiſtory of the Tavern.* And he does not attempt to make direct Proof of it from his, or from the Teſtimonies of *Bonner*, *Stapleton*, and *Harding*, but only by Conſequence, as he pretends, [u] *They deſtroy the Authority of the* Lambeth *Regiſter*; *and maintain that the Conſecration of* Parker *and his Brethren was not according to the* Old *or the* New *Ceremonial*; and all [w] *with one Voice affirm, that the Reformed Prelates were placed in their Sees by vertue of the Queen's Letters Patents only, without ever having received any Ordination whatſoever, without obſerving that which was in uſe in K.* EDWARD'*s time.* And in this he is followed by an *Engliſh* Writer of their Communion, who alſo confeſſes that [x] *Sanders does not expreſly mention the* Nag's-Head *in his Hiſtory*; but labours to make him and the others *Evidences* againſt the Conſecration recorded in the *Lambeth* Regiſter. With this View it is, as I intimated before, that *Le Quien* inſtead of reporting what the Author ſays, That our Biſhops had not any *Lawful* nor *Epiſcopal* Conſecration, puts theſe Words into his Mouth, That they had *no Ordination at all.* He attempts to make Proof of

[t] T. 1. p. 316. [u] Ibid. p. 317. [w] P. 319.
[x] Remarks upon F. Le Courayer's Defence of the Engliſh Ordinations, p. 95.

it

it in this Particular, that they were not conſecrated by the Form in K. *Edward*'s Ordinal; and therein is ſeconded, or rather out-done, by the *Engliſh* Writer juſt mentioned, who makes *Sanders expreſly* deny that they were conſecrated by that Form. *Le Quien* infers his Denial of it as a Conſequence of his ſaying that our Biſhops had no lawful Ordination; but this Writer is more quick-ſighted, and finds that the Author does not only deny it by Conſequence, but in expreſs Terms, *viz.* [y] That *after he had ſaid they ought to have been ordained by* K. EDWARD's *Ordinal, he expreſly tells us, But they were not ordained either by ſuch a Rite, or by ſuch Perſons as that required.*

Diſproof of what the Author of the Remarks *pretends to make* Sanders *ſay.*

3. [z] *Sanders* does expreſly ſay, they were not ordained *by ſuch Perſons* as the Law required, by a Metropolitan and two or three Biſhops; but it is not in the Power of the *Author of the Remarks* to ſhew us any Words of his, wherein he ſays expreſly, that they were not ordained by *ſuch a Rite.* 'Tis true theſe are his Words, "[a] The "Queen ſo diſpoſed of theſe Preferments, that "it was neceſſary for thoſe upon whom they "were confer'd to be ordained by certain Per-"ſons, and a certain Form, agreeably to the "Laws of the Realm." But does he preſently after theſe Words, ſay the Queen's Biſhops were not ordained by *ſuch a Form?* or does he in any other Place afterwards ſay any more than that they were not ordained *by ſuch Perſons?* So far he is from ſaying any thing more, that when, after giving an Account of the Statutes of *Hen.* VIII. and *Edw.* VI. reſtored by Q. *Elizabeth*, he comes to lay down how the Law required her Biſhops to be conſecrated, (in thoſe Words, [b] *So that it was neceſſary for theſe Biſhops of the Queen's*, &c.)

[y] P. 90, 92. [z] N. 3. [a] Sup. p. 3. [b] Sup. ibid.

he

he drops the Neceſſity of their being conſecrated by K. *Edward*'s Form, and mentions only that it was neceſſary that they ſhould have *Impoſition of Hands from two or three Biſhops, with the Conſent of the Metropolitan*; and accordingly charges them, in the next Words, with the Neglect of the Law in nothing elſe but the Want of a Metropolitan, and the legal Number of Biſhops. If he had meant to object the Want of that Form as well as the Want of thoſe Perſons, he might eaſily, and certainly would, have added, in the Words foregoing, that it was neceſſary they ſhould be ordained by that Ceremonial; but his neither laying down that Particular for one Ground of his Charge againſt our Biſhops, nor making that Objection any part of his Charge, ſhews plainly that he had no ſuch Objection to make; but that he knew they were actually ordained by that Form, and was ſenſible that if he had offered to deny it, he ſhould have been preſently convicted of a notorious Falſhood.

But I muſt not paſs over ſomething very particular in this *Remarker*'s Way of delivering *Sanders*'s Senſe. "[c] It is, he ſays, plainly this—— "That altho' the *Calvinian* Principles of the new "Prelates ſhould have made them ſcruple at the "Ceremonies which ought to have been then "uſed, and were uſed afterwards, yet their Scru- "ples did not hinder them from taking Biſhop- "ricks—— that the Ceremonies, the Surplices, "the Copes, the very Functions even of the New "Epiſcopacy, was what had ſtill, in their Opi- "nion, enough of the *Anti-Chriſtian*, and there- "fore they ought not in Conſcience to have ac- "cepted of them; that however, the Advantage "prevailed over their Scruples: In fine, that al- "tho' they ought to have been ſo ordained, yet

[c] P. 90, 91.

"in

" in effect it ſo happened, and *happened ridicu-*
" *louſly*, that they were not ſo ordained." I ſet down all this in his own Words, that the Reader may judge what he muſt be underſtood to ſay here, and if he ſays it, ſure he was not well awake. For how does he mean *the Advantage prevailed over their Scruples?* Was it not that it made them accept of thoſe *Anti-chriſtian Functions and Ceremonies*, at which otherwiſe their *Calvinian Principles ſhould have made them ſcruple?* Is not this accepting of thoſe Ceremonies the ſame with their ſubmitting to be conſecrated by thoſe Ceremonies? How can it then be *Sanders*'s Senſe, and the *Remarker* ſay from him, that they were not conſecrated by this Ceremonial? Is not this to ſay, that the Advantage prevailed over their Scruples, and made them ſubmit *to be ſo ordained*, and that *in fine* their Scruples prevailed over the Advantage, and it *happened they were not ſo ordained?* If it be ſaid that the Author of the *Remarks* did not ſo well know how to expreſs his own Meaning, but that his Meaning was, that they accepted of the Biſhopricks, but not of the Ceremonies; he is, beſides ſhewing us how they could be admitted to the Order and owned as Biſhops without being ſo ordained, to ſatisfy us, how it came to *happen ridiculouſly*, that the ſame Perſons, at the ſame time, and upon the ſame Occaſion, ſhould act the Part of conſcientious and ſcrupulous Men in one regard, and ſacrifice their Intereſt to their Scruples; and yet ſacrifice their Scruples to their Intereſt in the other reſpect, and act the Part of Men of no Religion or Conſcience. This is no Inſtance of this Writer's *Candour* or *Exactneſs*; with the Want of which he is ſo forward to charge [d] F. *Le Courayer*, for not *ſeeing*, as he does, *that this is what* Sanders *affirms*.

[d] P. 91.

4. F. *Le*

Diſproof of what Le Quien *infers from* Sanders's *Words.*

4. F. *Le Quien* does not pretend that it is expreſly ſaid by *Sanders*, that our Biſhops were not conſecrated by the Form in K. *Edward*'s Ordinal, but infers it as a Conſequence of his ſaying they had no lawful Conſecration: That the Author, after having ſaid that [e] *it was Queen* Elizabeth's *Will that her Biſhops ſhould be ordained by the New Ritual, with the Metropolitan's Conſent, and the Impoſition of Hands of two or three Biſhops*; *teſtifies* (*enſuite*, which may be underſtood preſently after) *that* Parker *and the reſt whom the Queen nominated at firſt did not receive any Ordination according to the Laws of the Church or State— and were proved by the Laws to be no Biſhops.* If the Father means that theſe Words follow immediately in the Place where *Sanders* ſays it was the *Queen's Will that her Biſhops ſhould be ordained by certain Perſons and a certain Rite*; what I have ſaid before [f] is enough to ſhew that he miſrepreſents the Author; who does not in that place ſay that they were not conſecrated by *that Rite*, nor that they had no lawful Ordination; but theſe laſt Words of his follow immediately after what he ſays, that *it was neceſſary they ſhould be ordained by two or three Biſhops, with the Metropolitan's Conſent*, and that *they had no Metropolitan, nor three or two Biſhops of their own*; *nor any from the Reformed Churches abroad, and were refuſed by the* Iriſh *Arch-Biſhop* [g]. This ſhews in what regard only he means they had no lawful Ordination: He concludes they had not, upon what he had ſaid, firſt of the Law, that it required their being ordained by ſuch Perſons; and then of the Fact, that they had no ſuch Perſons to ordain them: Theſe are his Premiſes; and can his Concluſion be any other than that they had no lawful Ordination, for want of

[e] T. 1. p. 324. [f] Sup. p. 29, 30. [g] Sup. p. 4.

theſe Perſons? Can it be that it was for want of *that Ritual* being uſed in their Ordination, which in the Words before he neither ſays the Law required, nor objects to them the Neglect of it? Can we ſuppoſe him to have ſo little Logick, as to infer in his Concluſion ſo much more than he had in his Premiſes?

But the Ground of *Le Quien*'s Reaſoning is, that *in what follows* the Author teſtifies that Parker *and the reſt of our firſt Biſhops did not receive any Ordination according to the Laws of Church or State*; and that *they were clearly proved by the Laws of the Land to be no Biſhops*; conſequently, *they were not conſecrated according to the Form preſcribed by the Laws of the Realm.* If *Sanders*'s Words, *Omni legitimâ Ordinatione deſtituti, Being without all lawful Ordination*, and *being proved by the Laws of* England *to be no Biſhops*, neceſſarily imply that their Ordination was unlawful in every Particular required by the Law, then the *Father*'s Way of arguing is concluſive: But if any one or two Defects in point of Law were enough to warrant thoſe Expreſſions, then this Reaſoning is wrong. It is a known Maxim in Morality, Divinity, and Law, *Bonum eſt ex causâ integrâ, malum ex quolibet defectu.* Any one Defect, as ſuppoſe the Want of a Number of Biſhops, might be a ſufficient Ground for the Author to ſay they had no lawful Ordination, tho' we could not ſay it was a lawful Ordination, except it were compleat according to Law in every Particular.

But without this, it were enough to ſay, that *Sanders* himſelf reſtrains and limits the Senſe of his Words: *So they being without any lawful Ordination.* Here he plainly refers to thoſe Defects which he had before objected: *So*, that is, by this means, their having had no Metropolitan, nor three, or two Biſhops. Can this refer to another Defect, *viz.* the Want of K. *Edward*'s

Form, if there be no mention in the Words before of any ſuch Defect? The Words therefore taken together plainly diſprove what *Le Quien* would infer from them.

Reflection upon what Sanders *ſays of the Want of a Metropolitan.*

5. This may be enough to ſhew what unfair Uſe is made of this Author, in attempting to make us believe he ſays that which he does not really ſay. But what he does ſay in the Paſſages above tranſlated, I ſhall now examine. After he ſays that Q. *Elizabeth* promoted ſuch Perſons only to be Biſhops as ſhould be ordained according to the Statutes of the Realm; he gives an Account of 8 K. *Henry*'s Statute which preſcribed the Method of making our Biſhops, after the Pope's Bull was laid aſide; which Statute, as he reports it, enacted, *That a Biſhop ſhould be conſecrated by three* (or as he ſays after, *two or three*) *Biſhops, with the Conſent of the Metropolitan; and that no Perſon otherwiſe ordained ſhould be owned as Biſhop.* And if this be a true and exact Account of that Statute, then he had very good Reaſon to ſay afterwards, *That it fell out very pleaſantly*, that they had not one Metropolitan by whoſe Conſent they might be conſecrated. For the See of *Canterbury* was vacant by *Poole*'s Death, and *Heath* of *York*, if he would have given his Conſent, was diſabled by Deprivation; and *Parker* was only Arch-Biſhop elect; and the *Iriſh* Arch-Biſhop, whom no Body but *Sanders* appears to have found out for them, could not, as he ſays, be prevailed upon; and therefore it is plain they could not have a lawful Conſecration for want of a Metropolitan's Conſent. But is *Sanders*'s Account of that Statute true and exact? Is there no Proviſion made in that Act of Parliament, in caſe there ſhould be no Metropolitan's Conſent to be had? Yes, there is very expreſly; as any one may ſee that reads the *Stat.* 25 *H.* VIII. *ch.* 20.

His Ignorance of K. Henry's *Statute.*

[8] Sup. p. 3.

ch. 20. The Purport of the *Statute*, in that chapter relating to this Matter is, That upon the Vacancy of a Biſhoprick or Arch-Biſhoprick, the Biſhop elected by the Chapter, or preſented by the King for Default of ſuch Election, ſhall be confirmed by the Arch-Biſhop, and conſecrated by him and two Biſhops; and the Arch-Biſhop elected, or preſented by the King for Default of Election, ſhall be confirmed and conſecrated by any Arch-Biſhop within this Realm, or other of the King's Dominions, and two Biſhops, or elſe by four Biſhops. Here it is plain that there is a Proviſion in the Act, that in the Vacancy of the Metropolitical See, four Biſhops may be empowered to confirm and conſecrate the Arch-Biſhop elect. But this our Hiſtorian did not ſee, or either miſtook or forgot what he read, and ſo left the Biſhops elect under an Impoſſibility of being conſecrated, for want of the Metropolitan's Conſent. *Le Quien*[h], when he introduces *Sanders*, to give him the greater Credit and Authority, tells us he could not but be well informed in what he relates, becauſe he wrote his Hiſtory before the middle of Q. *Elizabeth*'s Reign, and before the Year 1581. And he muſt indeed be preſumed within the Compaſs of near twenty two Years, from 1559, to 1581, to have had Time enough, and all Opportunities of informing himſelf fully of every thing relating to his Subject in our Hiſtories, Records, Statutes, and Regiſters; but it appears that he ſpent his time (as *Seneca* ſays Men uſually ſpend their whole Lives) *aut nihil agendo*, *aut aliud agendo*, *aut malè agendo*, either in doing nothing, or nothing to the purpoſe, or in making it his whole Buſineſs to collect only Matter for Lying and Scandal; otherwiſe, if he had been diligent and careful to know the Truth, how could he be guilty of ſo groſs Ignorance or Miſtake, as to ſay

[h] T. 1. p. 309.

that King *Henry*'s Statute requires a Metropolitan, when it allows and gives Power to four Biſhops to confirm and conſecrate the Arch-Biſhop elect, without a Metropolitan? Thus one half of our Author's Charge againſt our Ordinations as illegal, *viz.* the Want of a Metropolitan, has not the leaſt Ground in that Law which he quotes for it; becauſe that very Law provides that in ſuch a Caſe as that of our firſt Biſhops, there ſhould be no need of one. *Le Quien* implicitly took what the Author ſays for good Law, tho' himſelf had ſeen that very Statute, and tranſcribes [i] enough out of it to have ſhewed him *Sanders*'s Miſtake, and enabled him to correct the Author's Text in that Place to better Purpoſe than he does elſewhere. It is a Satisfaction to ſee how much better the Perſons concerned underſtood what the Law required, and proceeded accordingly. Several of them, beſides *Parker*, had been elected for ſome time by the Chapters of the vacant Sees, but none of them offered themſelves to be confirmed or conſecrated, before *Parker* (the Arch-Biſhop elect) had a canonical and legal Confirmation [k] (*Dec.* 9. 1599.) and Conſecration (*Dec.* 17.) by four Perſons, actually of the Epiſcopal Order, and legally qualify'd by vertue of the Queen's Commiſſion, *Barlow*, *Scory*, *Coverdale*, and *Hodgskins*. And then *Parker*, being Metropolitan, was by Law empowered upon the Queen's Mandate, dated *Dec.* 18. the Day after his Conſecration, to confirm and conſecrate ſome of the others, as he did confirm *Grindal*, *Cox*, *Sanders*, and *Meyrick*, *Dec.* 19. and conſecrated them, with the Aſſiſtance of *Barlow*, *Scory*, and *Hodgskins*, *Dec.* 21. and ſo afterwards proceeded to confirm and conſecrate others.

[i] T. 1. p. 490. [k] Strype's Life of M. Parker, p. 55, 56, 57. Parker's Regiſter at the End of Biſhop Bramhall's W. p. 1022, 1045.

6, But

6. But *Sanders* may be more in the right in what he ſays of the Want of Biſhops, and the Caſe then will be little better, tho' there were no need of a Metropolitan. His Words are, *They had not three or two Biſhops of their own Sect conſecrated before by other Biſhops, to lay Hands upon them.* Here too it appears he was ignorant in point of Law, for the *Stat.* 25 *Hen.* VIII. required no fewer than four Biſhops to conſecrate the Arch-Biſhop, one or two more than he thought of. But it is more material to conſider what he ſays in point of Fact. And in that regard he either contradicts himſelf preſently, or expreſſes himſelf very aukwardly, like a Man that is telling a Story he knows to be Fiction. He ſays, [l] *They were very urgent with an* Iriſh *Arch-Biſhop to help them, and made him large Promiſes,* ſi vellet iſtorum ordinationi præeſſe, *if he would* preſide *in the ordaining them.* To ſay *preſide*, looks as if the Author had ſome other Biſhops (two at leaſt) in his Head, over whom the *Iriſh* Arch-Biſhop was to preſide as Metropolitan, and they to aſſiſt him in the Ordination. But to let this paſs: Had he not before-hand more effectually confuted what he ſays in this part of his Story? He ſays before in the beginning of that which is tranſlated above [m], *There were come in very great haſte* (rapidiſſimè) *to divide the Spoil* (the vacant Church-Preferments) *thoſe who had fled* to *Savoy*, and other Places. Who were theſe? There were abroad, to avoid the Perſecution in Queen *Mary*'s time, beſides *Grindall*, *Cox*, *Sandys*, *Jewel*, *Horne*, *&c.* who were only in Prieſt's Orders, three of the Proteſtant Clergy who were already of the Order of Biſhops, *Barlow*, *Scory*, and *Coverdale*; and might not theſe three be in as great haſte as the

Confutation of what he ſays of the Proteſtants not having three Biſhops.

[l] Sup. p. 4. [m] Sup. p. 2.

other five, to have a Share in the vacant Biſhopricks? And had they not all more than time enough to come over, tho' they had not been in ſo great haſte as *Sanders* makes them to be, Queen *Elizabeth*'s Acceſſion to the Throne being in *November* 1558, and the Sees of the Popiſh Biſhops not being vacated till more than half a Year after, in *June* and *July*, 1559, and not one Proteſtant Biſhop conſecrated till *December* following? The Author could not be ignorant that *Scory*, and the other five above-named, were in *England* very early after Queen *Elizabeth*'s Acceſſion, ſome time before the *Conference* (*March* 31. 1559.) between eight Perſons on the Popiſh and eight on the Proteſtant Side, of which Number theſe ſix were; and *Sanders* could not well miſs them, becauſe he gives an Account of the Conference [n], and makes Reflexions upon the Manner wherein it was managed; particularly that *Bacon*, a Layman, ſhould take upon him to be *the Judge*; but there he ſays what is falſe, for *Bacon* [o] preſided only as Lord-Keeper, together with others of the Privy-Council, and pretended to no other Authority but to ſee that the Order agreed upon by Conſent of both Parties ſhould be obſerved; and [p] *Heath*, Arch-Biſhop of *York*, ſat with him and the reſt of the Council; and himſelf reproved his Brethren the Popiſh Biſhops for breaking the Order agreed upon. Biſhop *Scory* and the others that were to act their Parts in that Conference, ſhewed they came over ſo early, not *greedily* (as this *Calumniator* ſays) to *catch at* the vacant Biſhopricks of the Popiſh Prelates, but to do any Service to the Church and Religion that was in their Power, before they could know what Reward they might expect for it. The Bill that required the Biſhops

[n] P. 333. Edit. Ingolſtad. p. 234. [o] Burnet's Hiſt' of the Reform. Part 2, Collect. p. 345. Append. of Sanders's Errors and Falſhoods, p. 409. [p] Strype's Ann. P. 1. p. 90.

to take the Oath of Supremacy on pain of Deprivation, was depending in the Houſe of Lords at the time of the Conference, and had not finally paſſed both Houſes till *April* 29; and from that time till thoſe Biſhops had the Oath tendered to them and refuſed to take it, the Proteſtants had ſufficient Grounds from their former Compliances, to think they would, to ſave their Biſhopricks, comply once more and take it again; ſo little Reaſon had they before to build their Hopes of raiſing their Fortunes upon their ſucceeding the Deprived Popiſh Biſhops, who probably would have complied, if they had not been ſo infatuated as to think, that, [p] upon their refuſing one and all, the Church could not ſubſiſt without them. *Scory*, as is ſhewed, came over ſo early, and two others of *Parker*'s Conſecrators came after him, *Barlow* and *Coverdale*, both already of the Order, tho' not poſſeſſed of their Biſhopricks, of which they had been deprived, or had reſigned them, in Queen *Mary*'s Time; and the latter of theſe two, Biſhop *Coverdale*, did not return out of any haſty Ambition to take a Biſhoprick, either that of *Exeter*, which he had before, or any other, but choſe rather to accept of none, and to ſpend the ſhort Remainder of his Life in the Care of a private Pariſh. Theſe three Biſhops, and four others, were expreſly named in the Queen's Mandate (*Dec.* 6. 1559.) for the Confirmation and Conſecration of Arch-Biſhop *Parker*; ſo that ſetting aſide *Landaff* (who was one of the ſeven, and is owned by *Sanders* himſelf to be a Proteſtant ſo far as to relapſe into the [q] Schiſm) the Author could not well avoid being ſufficiently informed, that there were no fewer than ſix (if not

[p] Matthæus in Strype's Append. to Parker's Life, p. 148. Acworth's Anti-Sanderus, p. 196. Strype's Annals of Q. Eliz. P. 1. p. 143. [q] P. 261. Ed. Ingolſt.

ſeven) Biſhops of our own Religion, any four of whom had a Commiſſion by the Queen's Mandate to confirm and conſecrate the Arch-Biſhop elect. With ſo little Truth does he affirm that they had not *three nor two Biſhops of their own Sect to lay Hands upon them.*

False that they had no Biſhops conſecrated before by other Biſhops.

7. But it may be he had better Grounds to ſay they had not three, or two, *conſecrated before by other Biſhops.* His Words are, *Nec inter ſe aut tres duoſve Epiſcopos aut ullum omninò ſuæ perfidiæ Metropolitanum ab aliis Epiſcopis priùs ordinatum haberent.* Take him to mean both of our Metropolitan and Biſhops, that they had not been conſecrated by other Biſhops before; the Anſwer is, That there was not indeed any Metropolitan to conſecrate *Parker*; but the Law did not require any one in his Caſe, but allowed him to be conſecrated by four Biſhops; and that he had four ſuch Conſecrators, conſecrated before by other Biſhops, the Hiſtorian could not fail of being well informed, if he would have taken the Pains to look into the Records and Regiſters, and to know the Hiſtory of thoſe Times. *Barlow*, the firſt of them, he might have been ſatisfied, by a ſight of the Rolls[r], had been elected and confirmed Biſhop of St. *Aſaph*, *Ann.* 1535; and our Hiſtory would have informed him that he was always[f] looked upon to be a Biſhop conſecrated by Biſhops of the Church of *Rome*, in King *Henry*'s, King *Edward*'s, and Queen *Mary*'s Reigns; for tho' in the laſt he was deprived of his Biſhoprick, yet the Reaſon given for his Deprivation is his being married, and a Heretick, without the leaſt Intimation of his preſuming to act as a Biſhop without having received the Order by due Conſe-

[r] Rymer, T. 14. p. 558, 559. [f] See F. Le Courayer's Diſſertation, c. 3, 4. and his Defenſe of it, B. 3. c. 7, 8, 9, 10.

cration,

cration. 'Tis true, if *Sanders* had read over *Cranmer*'s Regiſter, he would have found that *Barlow*'s Conſecration is not entered there, but he could no more conclude from thence that he was not conſecrated, than he could from the ſame Omiſſion conclude, that *Gardiner* and ſeveral others never had any Conſecration. But *Cranmer*'s Regiſter might have given him ſufficient Evidence of the Conſecration of *Scory*, *Coverdale*, and *Hodgskins*, the other three of *Parker*'s Conſecrators. *Hodgskins* [t] had received his Conſecration ſo early as *Ann.* 1538. 29 *Hen.* VIII. from the then Biſhops of *London*, *Rocheſter*, and *St. Aſaph.* *Scory*'s [v] and *Coverdale*'s Conſecrators were *Cranmer*, *Ridley*, and *Hodgskins*. Of *Cranmer*'s Conſecration there is no Diſpute: *Ridley* [w] was conſecrated *Ann.* 1547. by *Cranmer*, *Hodgskins*, and *Sidon*; which laſt [x] had been, *Ann.* 1545. one of the Conſecrators of *Anthony Kitchin*, Biſhop of *Landaff*. So that all *Parker*'s Conſecrators were ſuch as had received Impoſition of Hands before from other Biſhops, then actually of the Church of *Rome*, or ſuch as had derived their Orders from them: And tho' he might pretend they were no Biſhops, becauſe they had been deprived of their Biſhopricks, and not reſtored or inveſted in other Sees before *Parker*'s Conſecration; and that *Scory* and *Coverdale* had not true Conſecration becauſe they were conſecrated by King *Edward*'s Form; yet he could not ſay with any Truth, that they had not Hands laid upon them *before by other Biſhops.*

What he ſays next, of their Attempt, by *Bribes and Promiſes of his Liberty*, to prevail upon an Iriſh *Arch-Biſhop whom they had in Priſon*, to give them

Falſe, that they attempted to be conſecrated by an Iriſh *Arch-Biſhop.*

[t] Reg. Cranm. fol. 204. Maſon's Vindiciæ, p. 372.
[v] Reg. Cranm. f. 334. Maſon, p. 209. [w] Reg. Cranm. f. 321. Maſon, ibid. [x] Reg. Cranm. f. 310. Maſon, p. 184.

them Conſecration, diſcovers itſelf very eaſily to be nothing but a bold groundleſs Fiction. For, beſides that they were under no Neceſſity, the Law requiring no more than four Biſhops, and they having more than that Number of Proteſtant Prelates; I would aſk, Who was that *Iriſh* Arch-Biſhop, and by the Authority of what Prince he was committed to Priſon? If by King *Edward* VI. he muſt have been ſet at Liberty again as ſoon as Queen *Mary* came to the Crown; and it cannot be conceived that when Queen *Elizabeth* ſucceeded her Siſter, ſhe found a Popiſh Arch-Biſhop impriſoned by Queen *Mary*, for the Profeſſion of her own Religion. The *Iriſh* Arch-Biſhops about the latter end of her Reign were *Dowdall* of *Armagh*, and three others: The former, who was the moſt likely to have deſerved Impriſonment from Queen *Elizabeth*, for oppoſing her Re-eſtabliſhment of the Reformation, died in *England*, in *Auguſt* 1558. three Months before the Death of Queen *Mary*; and there was no other inveſted in that See in that ſhort time before her Deceaſe: And the three other *Iriſh* Arch-Biſhops complied with the Alterations made by Queen *Elizabeth*. How then could the Hiſtorian, but from his own fruitful Invention, tell us of an *Iriſh* Arch-Biſhop in Priſon, and ſend our Prelates to him for Conſecration? *Fitz-Simon* [y] pretends to gueſs at the Name of this Arch-Biſhop, that it was *Creagh* of *Armagh*; but the Author of the *Nullity* [z] is more poſitive and confident, and tells Arch-Biſhop *Bramhall*, *that his Name was* Richard Creagh, *Arch-Biſhop of* Armagh. And he is followed by *Bruodine* [a], who tells us it was this *Martyr* of theirs, whom *Sanders* meant, tho' he has *concealed his Name*; and that *Iriſh* Writer gives an Account of his Impriſonment ſuitable to

[y] Britannomachia, p. 320. [z] P. 66. [a] Propugnaculum Catholicæ Veritatis, p. 430, 431.

the

the time when it is pretended he was requeſted, but refuſed, to do the Office. But the Vanity of their Attempt to help out *Sanders* in his Story, by finding a Name for his Arch-Biſhop, is ſufficiently ſhewed by the [b] learned and impartial Writer of the *Defence of our Ordinations*, who proves that *Creagh* was not made the titular Arch-Biſhop of *Armagh* till the Year 1563, nor impriſoned in *England* till 1564. much too late for *Parker* and our Prelates to make him a Viſit in Priſon, *Anno* 1559. to requeſt his executing the Office of Metropolitan and *preſiding* in their Conſecration.

This Refuſal of the Arch-Biſhop to conſecrate them, and their having not a Metropolitan or Number of Biſhops of their own, are the Grounds upon which *Sanders* takes upon him to affirm, that our Prelates were in great [c] Streight to get themſelves conſecrated, and that [d] they were *diſappointed of all lawful Conſecration*, and that they acted as Biſhops, and enjoyed their Sees *without any Epiſcopal Conſecration*. All theſe bold Aſſertions deſerve as much Credit as the falſe Pretences upon which they are founded.

8. His great Ignorance of our Affairs, or Falſhood in his Relation of them, diſcovers itſelf more plainly in what he ſays, that this obliged them [e] to call in the Help of the *Secular Arm*, and to get themſelves *confirmed in a following Parliament*. This following Parliament the *French* Tranſlation of the Author (publiſhed *Ann.* 1587.) makes the firſt *Aſſembly of the Eſtates*. But I would aſk, Was this Parliament, wherein they are ſuppoſed to get themſelves confirmed, the firſt Aſſembly of the Eſtates of the Realm after the Year 1559? No: Queen *Elizabeth*'s next Parliament,

Reflection upon what he ſays of their being confirmed in a following Parliament.

[b] Le Courayer's Defence of his Diſſertation, Book 2. c. 2. Engl. Edit. Vol. 1. p. 157, to 161. [c] P. 297. Edit. Ingolſt. in Marg. [d] Sup. p. 4. [e] Sup. ibid.

ment, after that which ended *May* 8. 1559. began *Jan.* 12. 156$\frac{2}{3}$. and ſat till the tenth of *April* following; then it was prorogued to *Octob.* 2. 1563. and from that time had five ſucceſſive Prorogations, till at laſt, after *Sept.* 30. 1566. they ſat down to do Buſineſs; and then in *October* the Bill was brought in, *Declaring the Manner of making and conſecrating the Arch-Biſhops and Biſhops of this Realm to be good, lawful, and perfect*; which paſſed into an Act, *Jan.* 2. 156$\frac{6}{7}$. in the Concluſion of that Seſſion and Parliament. All which will appear plainly to any one who looks into the *Journals*. So that in the firſt Aſſembly of the Eſtates after their Conſecration, the Parliament *Ann.* 156$\frac{2}{3}$. there was not, tho' they ſat as Peers in that Seſſion, the leaſt Motion made for a Bill to be brought in to confirm them by the Lay-Power, tho' they muſt by that time have acted as Biſhops, and enjoyed their Sees, for full three Years, *without* (as this Author ſays) *any Epiſcopal Conſecration*. Nor were there any Attempts made afterwards, at any of the times to which the Parliament was ſo often prorogued, to prevail upon the Queen and the Two Houſes to ſit down and take their Caſe into conſideration, notwithſtanding the pretended urgent Neceſſity of ſupplying their Want of Ordination, by making them, as ſoon as poſſible, *Parliamentary Biſhops*. But at laſt, after ſeven Years had paſſed from the time of their Conſecration, a Bill is brought in, and paſſed in the eighth Year of the Queen, *Jan.* 156$\frac{6}{7}$. to confirm them. If they had at firſt no lawful Conſecration, but depended upon their being confirmed by the Lay-Power, how came they to be in no more haſte when they had been at firſt ſo haſty to get the Biſhopricks? How could they ever ſleep quietly, being for ſo many years under the continual Apprehenſions of loſing their Biſhopricks for want of being lawfully conſe-

crated,

crated, and beſides of incurring the ſevere Penalty of a *Premunire* for acting againſt the Preſcript of the *Statute* 25 *Hen.* VIII. in their Ordination? If they had no lawful Conſecration, as *Sanders* ſays, or no Conſecration at all, as *Le Quien* makes him ſay, or that which would have been worſe than none, the Ordination at the *Nag's-Head*; if this were their Caſe, and they themſelves, the Queen, or Lord-Keeper *Bacon*, or Secretary *Cecil*, and the reſt of their Friends in the Miniſtry, were ſenſible of it, and the Queen and they were concerned to favour them; can it be imagined, but that very ſoon an Aſſembly of the Eſtates would have been called on purpoſe to confirm them, or a Bill brought in for that Intent in the Parliament 156⅔, or at ſome other times when they met after the ſeveral Prorogations, before the Year 1566. If the ſupplying their Want of Orders were the Occaſion of the Bill being brought in, in the Parliament of that Year, they and their Friends muſt be either Madmen or Fools in deferring ſo long what they wanted to have done for them as ſoon as poſſible: But it is very plain there was another Occaſion to have that Bill laid before the Two Houſes; I mean [f] *Bonner*'s Plea againſt *Horne* (as conſecrated by King *Edward*'s Ordinal, not expreſly re-eſtabliſhed by Queen *Elizabeth* after it had been abrogated by Queen *Mary*) which lay before the Courts of Juſtice, *Ann.* 6 & 7 *Eliz.* but was thought proper to be effectually put an end to, by the Authority of the Queen and the Eſtates, in the Statute in the eighth Year of her Reign. So much of Truth, as *Bonner*'s pleading that *Horne* was No Biſhop, and that Plea being received in the Court of King's-Bench in order to a Trial, and the Noiſe that this made among the

[f] Strype's Life of Matth. Parker, p. 60, 61. Id. Hiſt. of Reform. under Q. Eliz. p. 493.

Party, and the Parliament's paſſing the Act that declared their Conſecration to be good, lawful, and perfect, was all the Foundation that *Sanders* had, to build his lying Story upon, that they [g] *had not any lawful Ordination*, that *it was commonly reported*, and that *they were proved by the very Laws of* England, *to be no Biſhops*, and were forced to apply *to a following Parliament* to be *confirmed by the Secular Power:* As if this Seſſion of Parliament had been the very firſt that happened after they were made Biſhops, and their being unlawfully made at firſt (and not the Cavil of King *Edward*'s Form by which they were conſecrated wanting a legal Eſtabliſhment, and the lying Reports among the Party, that followed upon that Plea of *Bonner* and his Council, being admitted in Court) had been the true and only Occaſion of bringing in and paſſing the Act in this Parliament to confirm them.

But what does he ſay was to be done in this Parliament to confirm them? *They were to be forgiven, Si quid minùs ritè nec ad præſcriptum Legum in priori inauguratione geſtum eſſet aut omiſſum; If any thing in their former Inauguration had been done or left undone, not ſo well and exactly according to the Rules of Law. Minùs ritè* geſtum aut omiſſum, *not ſo well* done or left undone! How modeſtly does our Author ſpeak of that for which they ſtood in need of a Pardon or Act of Grace, inſtead of aggravating their high Crime and Miſdemeanour, their daring Preſumption in taking Poſſeſſion of the vacant Sees, and keeping them ſo long without ever having been made lawful Biſhops? Does it not look as if he knew very little of what was done or left undone, *not ſo well or according to Law*, in their Ordination? And does not the ſame thing appear by what he ſays in the

[g] Sup. p. 4.

Conclu-

Concluſion, immediately after he gives them the Name of *Parliament-Biſhops*, and is paſſing on to another Story, *Qualeſcunque fuerint aut quomodocunque facti ſant iſti Pſeudo-Epiſcopi, &c. Whatſoever kind of Biſhops theſe Falſe Biſhops were, or in what manner ſoever they were made, they proved afterwards to be Lions and Wolves to their Flocks.* If they were only *Parliament*-Biſhops, how comes he to be uncertain what *ſort of Biſhops* they were? or if they were made only by the Queen's Letters Patents, or an Act of Parliament, without any lawful Conſecration, could he be at a Loſs to ſay *in what manner* they were made? Does it not rather appear by this Uncertainty and Miſgiving, that his Conſcience told him he was in a Lye, and ſo what he had declared before as of his own Knowledge, he does afterwards in effect own himſelf to be ignorant of? Juſt as if a Man ſhould charge another with committing Murther, and afterwards come off with ſaying, Whether he killed the Man or no, or in what manner ſoever he took away his Life, he has ſhewed himſelf ſince to be a Rogue and a Thief, and to deſerve to be hanged.

I ſhould go beyond the Bounds of my Subject, if I ſhould proceed to examine what Grounds he had for this Calumny, wherewith he is willing farther to blacken the Proteſtant Biſhops. It is more proper to deſire the Reader to conſider how little Ground *Le Quien* has, after he has produced theſe Paſſages of *Sanders*, to ſay with Confidence that [h] *every Word* in the Author is *precis*, that is, full, exact, and home to the purpoſe, to deſtroy [i] the Authority of the Account of *Parker*'s Ordination in the *Lambeth* Regiſter? Are his Words, that they had *no Metropolitan, or three or two Biſhops*, that they had *no Lawful* or *no Epiſcopal*

[h] T. 1. p. 313. [i] Ibid. p. 317.

Conſe-

Conſecration, that there was *ſomething* minùs rite, *not ſo well*, done or omitted in their *Inauguration*, that they were *proved by Law to be No Biſhops*, and that they were *called Parliament-Biſhops*, and were *Falſe Biſhops*, let them be of *whatever Sort*, and be *made after what Manner ſoever:* Are theſe Expreſſions home and deciſive to prove, that they had not ſo much as *one* Biſhop to lay Hands upon them, or (ſuppoſing no true Biſhop) that they had not Impoſition of Hands from the *Perſons named in the Regiſter*, nor from *any* Perſons *at all*; that they had [k] *no Conſecration whatſoever*, *no Impoſition of Hands*, *no Solemnity*, *no Eccleſiaſtical Ceremony*, either according to the *Roman Pontifical*, or King *Edward*'s *Ordinal*, nothing but the *Queen's Letters Patents*, or nothing but the Mock-Conſecration at the *Tavern?* If ſo, then the Author's Words come up to *Le Quien*'s Purpoſe; if not, the Author is artfully miſrepreſented, both in his Tranſlation and Extract, and in his way of arguing from the Words of his Author.

Of what Credit Sanders *ought to be eſteemed.*

9. It is much more juſt to obſerve that almoſt every Word in *Sanders* diſcovers his Ignorance or Falſhood, either in Matter of Law or Fact, (notwithſtanding he had more than twenty Years time to inform himſelf of the Subject about which he writ) and makes good in this Part of his Work that Character of him which we have from Biſhop *Burnet*, [l] *That he was a Stranger to the Publick Tranſactions*, *Printed Statutes*, *and Authentick Regiſters of that time*, *and a bold and impudent Aſſerter of the groſſeſt and moſt malicious Lies.* This Cenſure of him is fully juſtified, throughout the greateſt part of his three Books of the *Engliſh Schiſm*, in the *Appendixes* to both Volumes of the *Hiſtory of the Reformation*, where he is convicted,

[k] Sup. p. 2. [l] Hiſt. Reform. p. 1. Collect. p. 302.

almoſt

almoſt in every Page of his Work, either of groſs ignorance, or ſcandalous Falſhood and Calumny. And yet, as if *Le Quien* were a Stranger to all that is ſaid by *Burnet*, *Camden*, and others, of *Sanders*'s Character; or as if he were able to juſtify him againſt all exception, he thinks it to be for his own Credit to make this Hiſtorian a Grand Evidence to diſprove the Truth of the Account of *Parker*'s Ordination, and to inſiſt upon his Authority as of weight enough to oblige us to believe, rather that the Regiſter is forged, than that what this Author ſays in this Part of his Hiſtory can be called in queſtion. Sure the *Father* has a mean Opinion of the Judgment both of his Proteſtant and Popiſh Readers! Yet he is ſo little aſhamed of producing the Teſtimony of ſuch an Author, as to [m] reproach the learned *F. Le Courayer*, for overlooking thoſe Paſſages of *Sanders* that *Le Quien* gives us an Extract of, and puts the Queſtion whether that Omiſſion ought to be imputed to *Forgetfulneſs or Deſign*: So little Charity has he for that *Writer*, and ſo very much for the Other, whom he could not ſuſpect either of Deſign or Forgetfulneſs, in the falſe Report that he makes of the Statute 25 *Hen.* VIII. relating to the making of our Biſhops, tho' he had that Statute before his Eyes, and tranſcribes [n] ſo much of it, as I obſerved before, that he could not but ſee the Miſtake, if he had been at leiſure to make that Reflection.

In this likewiſe, *Le Quien* is followed by the Author of the *Remarks*, who imputes the Character our Writers give of *Sanders* to the [o] *uſual Spleen of Proteſtants againſt that* learned Hiſtorian, and [p] *pities them for the extreme Spleen they ſhew againſt him*; but thinks fit to reflect ſeverely upon

[m] T. 1. p. 316. [n] T. 1. p. 490. [o] P. 87. [p] P. 93.

F. *Le Courayer* for [q] *joining in the Cry of Proteſtants in blackening that* Great Man. As Great as the *Remarker* eſteems him, his Character is ſhewn to be very black in the *Appendix's* to the *Hiſtory of the Reformation*; and neither the *Hiſtorian*, nor any body for him, does deſire that the Cenſure he paſſes upon *Sanders* ſhould be believed upon his Word (or his *Hiſtorical Faith* which the *Remarker* ſays [r] *ought not to be heeded*) but upon the full and undeniable Proof of the Ignorance and Falſhood of that Writer almoſt throughout his whole Work. And after this has been ſo undeniably proved, and almoſt half a Century has paſſed ſince the Time when ſo good Proof was made of it; with what Face can the Author of the *Remarks*, as if he were able to vindicate *Sanders* from *Burnet*'s Charge of *Errors* and *Falſhoods*, think it enough to complain of the *common Cry and uſual Spleen of* Proteſtants *againſt that* Great Man *and* Learned Hiſtorian, and to *pity them for the extreme Spleen they ſhew againſt him*; without having ſo much Compaſſion for them as to ſhew them their groundleſs and uncharitable Miſtakes, by wiping off that Scandal and Reproach, which they, with ſo great Injuſtice, in his Opinion, pretend to caſt upon that Writer? The Hiſtory of the *Engliſh Schiſm* is not ſo large as to require much Time and Pains to go through it, and to compare it with *Burnet*'s Animadverſions, and the Anſwers of Monſ. *Le Grand* in his *Defence of Sanders*; or let the *Remarker*, if he has not ſo much leiſure, read but ſix Pages in the firſt Book, from the 14th to the 19th Page of the Edition at *Ingolſtadt*, *A.* 1588. (which is that he uſes) and if he be not of himſelf ſick of his Author before he has done, then let him compare what he has read with [s] *Burnet's Hiſtory of the Reformation*, and his [t] *Appendix* at

[q] P. 197. [r] P. 41. [s] Part 1. p. 41. to p. 44. [t] P. 278, 279.

the

the end of the *Collection of Records*, on the one Side, and with M. *Le Grand*'s *Defence of Sanders*, on the other. *Sanders* there in a ſhort Compaſs diſcovers his admirable Talent of writing Hiſtory, in his Account of Queen *Anne Boleyn* (to blacken whoſe Character he ſticks at no Lies or Calumnies which he can invent himſelf, or rake up from others.) [u] Of her being begotten by King *Henry* VIII. in an Act of Adultery with the Lady of Sir *Tho. Boleyn*, the King having ſent Sir *Thomas* Embaſſador into *France* to be out of the way: (which Circumſtance [w] alone well conſidered proves the Hiſtorian to be in a Lye) Of her being guilty of Lewdneſs with her reputed Father's [x] Chaplain, and Butler, at the Age of fifteen: Which Chaplain *Bruodine* [y] has the Confidence to tell us was *Cranmer*; and let any Man give Credit to that *Iriſh Evidence*, who can believe that *Cranmer* was the Perſon, and *Sanders* could be ſo willing to ſpare his Memory as not to let the World know his Name. Of her giving herſelf up afterwards, at the *French* Court, [z] to be a common Proſtitute, and going by the Name of the *Engliſh Hackney:* Notwithſtanding which, and the Deformity of her Perſon [a], (which the Author deſcribes, to make his Story conſiſtent with itſelf) the King of *France* [b] thought fit to take her to be his Miſtreſs, whereby ſhe got another Name of the *King's Mule*; and at her Return from *France*, ſhe ſo far captivated King *Henry* with her Charms, that [c] refuſing to be made his Concubine, as both her Mother and Siſter had been, ſhe had the Addreſs to jilt him

[u] P. 14. Edit. Ingoldſt. Col. 1585. fol. 15. [w] Burnet Part 1. p. 43. Append. p. 278. [x] P. 16. Col. f. 16, 17. [y] Propugnaculum Catholicæ Veritatis Edit. Prag. 1669. L. 3. c. 1. p. 245. c. 2. p. 249. [z] P. 16. Col. f. 16, 17. [a] Ingolſt. ibid. Col. f. 16. [b] Ibid. Col. f. 17. [c] P. 17. Col. f. 17.

into the making her his Wife: And this, when Sir *Thomas Boleyn* [d] was fain to come over on purpoſe to let the King know ſhe was not his but the King's own Daughter; and ſome of the Privy Council acquainted King *Henry* in Sir *Thomas Wyat*'s Name, that ſhe was at that very Time Sir *Thomas*'s [e] Whore; and that if the King pleaſed he would give him an Opportunity of ſeeing it with his own Eyes. This Relation, adorned with other incidental Stories of like Nature, [f] of the merry Converſation between King *Henry* and Sir *Francis Bryan* upon this ſad Subject of Adultery and Inceſt; and [g] of Sir *Thomas Boleyn*'s ſuing his Lady for the Adultery in order to a Divorce, but letting the Suit fall and forgiving his Wife, by the King's expreſs Command: All this, I ſay, we have in *Sanders*, near the Beginning of his firſt Book. For which I refer in the Margin to the firſt Edition at *Colen*, as well as to that at *Ingolſtadt*, that neither the *Remarker* nor any body elſe may ſay that any one Particular, of all this complicated Falſhood and Slander, was not in the Author's own Work, but is an Interpolation added afterwards in the later Editions. This is M. *Le Grand*'s [h] Pretence upon which he is willing to ſtrike out of the Number almoſt fifty of the Paſſages cenſured in the *Appendix* to the *Hiſtory of the Reformation*, and ſpeaks as if *Burnet* there affected to appear unacquainted with the firſt Edition, and made choice of a very late one (*Colen*, A. 1628.) on purpoſe to make the Author reſponſible for ſo many more Errors and Falſhoods: Tho' *Le Grand* could not but know, I believe, that they are every one to be found in the Edition printed at *Rome* the very next Year after the firſt

[d] Ibid. Col. f. 18. [e] P. 18, 19. Col. f. 19, 20. [f] P. 15. Col. f. 16. [g] P. 14. Col. f. 15. [h] Defence de Sanderus, T. 2. del Hiſt. du Divorce de Hen. 8. p. 6.

came out at *Colen*; and he ſhould have been able to ſhew how it came to paſs that, ſo ſoon after the Book was publiſhed from the Copy that came thro' *Riſhton*'s Hands, they ſhould at *Rome*, without any Warrant from ſome other Copies (which *Riſhton* [i] himſelf owns there were both in *Italy* and *Spain*) put out an Edition ſo very different from that at *Colen* the Year before, that *Le Grand* ſays it [k] *may be called a new Work*. However, in this Piece of Hiſtory, he has no Room for that Pretence in Defence of the Author, but is obliged almoſt wholly to give him up, tho' with ſo great Tenderneſs, as only to ſay, that *he uſes* A. Boleyn *too hardly*, and is *carry'd too far* (he does not ſay in his Malice) *againſt her*: [l] *Il maltraite trop* Anne de Boulen, and [m] *il eſt trop emporté contre* Anne de Boulen, are his Words.

10. *Sanders*'s credulous Readers muſt be prepared, if this Scandal upon that Queen could paſs with them, to believe all the Lies and Calumnies that follow, and even the Fable of the Nag's-head Ordination, if he had taken upon him to make himſelf the Author of that Story, when he came to have an Opportunity in his Third Book. But his not giving us a Relation of that Ordination there, when, if he knew it, it muſt be ſuppoſed to lie before him in the Courſe of his Hiſtory, is a Demonſtration to any conſidering and impartial Perſon, that it can be nothing but a Forgery of them that came after him. If it had been real Matter of Fact, and publickly known, as is pretended, ſo early as in his Time, he of all Men could not be unacquainted with it, but muſt have been fully informed of all Particulars, being ſeveral Years before the beginning of Queen *Eli-*

Sanders *ignorant of any ſuch Fact as the* Nag's-Head *Conſecration.*

[i] Preface to Sanders's Hiſtory, all the Editions. [k] P. 6. [l] P. 11. [m] P. 47.

zabeth's Reign of a competent Age and in a proper State of Life to obſerve the Publick Tranſactions in Church Affairs, and having, in order to write his Hiſtory, been at work to enquire into all the Proceedings of the Reformation for ſo many Years, as long as half the Time between Arch-Biſhop *Parker*'s Conſecration and the firſt Appearance of the *Nag's-Head* Fable. The more irregular, weak, and wicked thoſe Proceedings might appear to be, the more it ſuited his Principles and Inclination, and the very End and Deſign of his Hiſtory, to lay them open in the moſt full and particular Manner. Let any Man therefore ſuppoſe a Writer of *Sanders*'s Temper and Principles, and one ſo perfectly inſtructed as he muſt have been in the whole Matter, and tell me whether it was poſſible for him, when he came to ſpeak of the Ordination, to give ſo very lame and imperfect an Account of it, without a Word of the main and principal Paſſages which make the Body of the Story, but only ſomething that looks like the Beginning and End, with a Gap between them wide enough for the Narratives of *Sacroboſco*, and all the Writers in the beginning of the following Century (if their different Stories could be made to ſtand together) to be brought in. If the Reader looks back to the Tranſlation of [n] *Sanders*, he ſees that what he ſays there is, "That upon the Refuſal of the Catholick Biſhops, and their having no Number of their own, or from the Proteſtants abroad, they applied themſelves to an *Iriſh Arch-Biſhop* to be conſecrated by him, but were diſappointed." And then concludes, *that they had no lawful Ordination*, and were forced to get an Act of Parliament ſix or ſeven Years after to confirm them. Is it not plain that either he knew nothing of the Tavern-Story when he ſpeaks thus, or that

[n] Sup. P. 4.

he

he was blind and infatuated, not to ſee, that after he had ſpoken of the *Iriſh* Arch-Biſhop's diſappointing them, his Subject required him to go on and ſay, " Upon his Refuſal they addreſſed themſelves to the *Welſh* Biſhop of *Landaffe*, and he " at firſt appeared to be coming into their Meaſures, and gave them a Meeting at a Tavern; " but when they were met, a Meſſage from " *Bonner* obliged the timorous Biſhop to deſiſt " and to beg their Excuſe, and they were forced " to deſire *Scory* to perform the Ceremony; " which he did in a ridiculous Manner that pleaſed " his Fancy, and ſo they all roſe up Biſhops, " and ſome of them when they were got up ordained him who had been their Conſecrator." And then his Concluſion to follow, " So they being diſappointed of any lawful Ordination, *&c.* " were forced to get themſelves confirmed by a " following Parliament." I give no more than a ſhort Abridgment of the Story, from what is ſet down at length in *Sacroboſco* and *Champney*, which no queſtion *Sanders* would have been as able and willing as either of them to have given a full Relation of, with proper Enlargements upon every particular Circumſtance, and due Reflections upon the ſcandalous Profaneneſs of the Action, if it had ever come to his Knowledge. But his paſſing a Fact over in Silence, which beſides its falling within the Compaſs of his own Obſervation at the very Time, he could not have failed afterwards, while he was gathering Materials for his Hiſtory, to be fully informed of, if he deſired it, by *Neale* himſelf, by *Bonner*, and others of the Deprived Biſhops, and by the cotemporary Writers *Harding*, *Stapleton*, &c. thoſe *knowing Perſons* (as we have it in the Writer of the ° *Nullity of the Prelatick Clergy*) *who made it their Buſineſs*

° P. 1.

to enquire after the Ordination at the very ſame Time and Place wherein it is pretended to have been acted; (and ſure it was more this Hiſtorian's Buſineſs than theirs) his paſſing ſuch a Fact over in Silence, is a deciſive and unanſwerable Argument, that he was utterly ignorant of it, and that no ſuch Matter ever happened within his Knowledge, or the Memory of any other Perſons from whom he might have Information, to give it a Place in his Hiſtory. No longer after Arch-Biſhop *Parker*'s Conſecration than the Year 1567, he had the Confidence to inſult that Prelate as no Biſhop, by dedicating his Book of the [p] *Rock of the Church* to Dr. *Parker*, *bearing the Name of Arch-Biſhop of* Canterbury; and could he have forborn at that Time to have told him and the World (if he had known it) how he came *to bear that Name*, and in what *Place* and Manner the Title was conferr'd upon him? Which Diſcovery, if made good, would have been enough not only to have covered *Parker* and his Brethren with Shame and Confuſion, but to have cruſhed the Cockatrice of the *Engliſh* Miniſtry in the Egg. But not to tell the Story then, nor afterwards when the Hiſtory of the Schiſm led him to give an Account of the Ordination of Queen *Elizabeth*'s firſt Biſhops, in order to expoſe the Irregularity of it (which he ſhews himſelf to be ſo ready to do as far as he is able) ſufficiently proves him to be a perfect Stranger to that pretended Tranſaction. It muſt not be denied that, from the Evidence we have of his inveterate Malice againſt the Reformed Church of *England*, and his Readineſs to publiſh all the impudent Lies and Calumnies which his own Invention or the Aſſiſtance of the *Father of Lies* could ſuggeſt to him, it is reaſonable to think that he would not have been wanting to frame an

[p] Maſon L. 3. c. 8. p. 337.

Hiſtory

Hiſtory of ſuch a Conſecration from his own Brain, as well as that Part of it which the following Writers have from him of the *Iriſh* Arch-Biſhop, and would have exerciſed his Talent as well upon that Subject, as he does upon Queen *Anne Boleyn*'s Birth and Character: But he muſt have ſo much Wit as to ſee, that it was not proper to attempt it at that Time, when ſo many Perſons were alive who were able to convict him of a notorious Lie and diabolical Slander: And this too his Editor *Riſhton* muſt be ſenſible of, who publiſhed his *Poſthumous* Work four Years after the *Author*'s Death, and owns he made ſome *Additions* to it, in the *Third* Book eſpecially, whereof this Story would no queſtion have been one, if he had had any Ground or Colour for ſuch an impudent Fiction, and had not ſeen that it would expoſe both him and *Sanders* for a baſe and ſcandalous Forgery.

Tho' it is ſo plain from *Sanders* himſelf, that he never had heard or dream'd of the *Nag's-Head* Ordination, yet the following Writers, from whom, ſo long after his Deceaſe, we have the Diſcovery, are very willing to father it upon him, to make it carry an Appearance of an earlier Date, and a greater Authority. *Fitz-Simon* [q] draws up a Catalogue of the Authors that deliver the Story, he is going to tell, before himſelf, and puts *Sanders* at the Head of the firſt Claſs, thoſe who, he ſays, have it *in terminis*, in expreſs Words, ſuch as *Parſons*, *Sacroboſco*, *Kelliſon*, and others: But he has no other Ground to pretend that *Sanders* relates the Story, but that he himſelf makes the Fiction about the *Iriſh* Arch-Biſhop, in that Author, a Part of it. *Kelliſon* likewiſe relates from him, as Part of the Story, that they were [r] *fain to make ſuit to a Biſhop of* Ireland, and

[q] Britannomachia p. 316. [r] Reply to Sutcliffe, f. 31.

upon

upon his *refuſing, they made one another Biſhops*; but their *making one another Biſhops* no body elſe, before or after him, could find in that Author but himſelf. *Sacroboſco*, and the *Prefacer* to *Parſons*, refer in their Margin to *Sanders*, and are willing to make uſe of his Authority, tho' they have not a Word of the *Iriſh* Arch-Biſhop, but only of *Landaff*.

LeQuien's and the Remarker's frivolous Reaſons why he might be informed of the Story, and yet not ſpeak a Word of it.

11. F. *Le Quien* finds himſelf to be obliged to acknowledge, [q] *It is true that* Sanders *does not expreſly tell the Story of the Tavern:* And after him the *Remarker* confeſſes, that [r] he *does not expreſly mention it in his Hiſtory*. But both of them are very willing it ſhould be believed that he was fully informed of the whole Matter, but kept the worſt part of it to himſelf upon prudential Reaſons. *Le Quien* [s] ſays it was not neceſſary for him to relate it, and proceeds to give Reaſons why there was no Neceſſity. The *Remarker* [t] ſays, *We ſhall ſee* Sanders *might well omit the Particulars of it upon good Reaſons:* And thoſe Reaſons he gives us [u] afterwards. The firſt Omiſſion they account for is, his ſaying nothing of the Place, the *Nag's-Head* Tavern. *Le Quien* ſays, [w] *There being a Chapel in the Tavern, the Place did not appear ſo indecent as to oblige him to relate that Circumſtance.* This appears to be a piece of great News; but we owe wholly to *Kelliſon*'s Wit, and *Le Quien*'s Judgment, the Diſcovery which the latter makes, from nothing but a Jeſt in the *Index* of the former to his Anſwer to *Sutclyffe*, [x] That there was a *Chapel* ſet apart and conſecrated in that Tavern; and no queſtion *Sanders* muſt know as well that there was a Chapel, as he knew that there was a Conſecration there of our Biſhops: But then what

[q] T. 1. p. 316. [r] P. 95, 194. [s] P. 328.
[t] P. 95. [u] P. 194. [w] Ubi ſupra. [x] T. 1. p. 218.

Excuſe

Excuſe can they make for the Hiſtorian, that he ſhould not expoſe the Perſons concerned as Men void of all Senſe of Religion, that could meet to perform a Sacred Office, in a Sacred Place, and yet were ſo far from conſidering where they were, or what they were about, as not to have either Prayers, or Sermon, or the Holy Communion, or any calling upon God and his Holy Spirit, in the Ceremony; of all which the very place muſt have put them in mind, if they had not been hardned in Irreligion and Profaneneſs? So that this Circumſtance, tho' it makes the *Place not ſo indecent*, yet it makes the Ceremony ſo much the more indecent and ſcandalous. The *Remarker* had better Opportunity to enquire, whether there was a Chapel formerly at the *Nag's-Head*, and it diſappeared ever ſince the great *Fire* of *London*; and finding, we may preſume, that there was never any ſuch Chapel, was obliged not to follow his Leader *Le Quien*, but to think of ſome other plauſible Reaſon for that Omiſſion in the Author, [y] *That having before ſufficiently proved the Invalidity of the Ordination, it was unneceſſary to name the Place, the Place preciſely adding no new Proof to the Invalidity.* What *Sanders* ſays of the Invalidity is, that *they were deſtitute of all lawful Ordination*; and what could better prove their Ordination to be invalid in point of Law, than for the Law to preſcribe that the Biſhops ſhould be conſecrated *in facie Eccleſiæ*, in a Church or Chapel, and for this Conſecration to be performed, inſtead of the Place appointed by Law, not ſo much as in a private Houſe, but in a Tavern? Beſides, how can they excuſe him for making no Reflections upon *the ridiculous Idea* (as the *Remarker* expreſſes it) [z] *which naturally riſes at the very hearing of Biſhops meeting at a Tavern to be conſecrated*;

[y] P. 194. [z] P. 192.

or

or rather, the Horror that any religious Perſon muſt be ſtruck with, at the Profaneneſs of a Conſecration over a Bottle, and an Attempt to make the intended Conſecrator *Landaff* drunk, in order to bring him to a Compliance, which the *Wisbich* and *Framlingham* [a] Confeſſors, and after them the Writer of the [b] *Nullity of the Prelatick Clergy* give for a Reaſon of their meeting in ſuch a Place? How, I ſay, can they excuſe his not expoſing the Ridiculouſneſs and horrible Profaneneſs of ſuch an Ordination, upon ſo weak a Pretence, as that he had ſaid *enough to prove the Invalidity of the Ordination, and the Place preciſely added no new Proof to the Invalidity?*

The next Omiſſion in *Sanders*, which they give a Reaſon for, is his not naming the Witneſſes of the Fact, which they ſay he does not, becauſe it might have brought them into Trouble. But who are the Witneſſes that might have ſuffered by this Author's relating the whole Story? The Author of the *Remarks* tells us, [c] *To name* Neale *or* Bonner, *or other particular Witneſſes of the Tavern Buſineſs, would have laid them open to a* Præmunire. *Bonner* died *Ann.* 1569, probably before *Sanders* began to write his *Hiſtory of the Schiſm*, ſo that he might have ſaid there what he pleaſed of that Prelate, and vouched his Authority for any thing he had a mind to ſay, without fear of bringing him into the Danger of a *Præmunire*. *Neale* out-lived *Sanders*, but was between fourſcore and ninety Years of Age when *Sanders*'s Hiſtory was publiſhed, *Ann.* 1585. if *Wood*'s Account be true of the time of *Neale*'s Death; and the reſt of *Wood*'s Account of him proves him to be fit rather to be brought for a Witneſs to diſprove the Truth of the Tavern

[a] Letters between Wadſworth and Bedell, p. 142.
[b] Prefacer, n. 10. Book p. 13, 14, 78. [c] P. 194.

Ordina-

Ordination, than to ſuffer for any Part he is pretended to have had in it. But let this be as it will, is it not ridiculous for *Le Quien* or the *Remarker* to give this Reaſon why *Sanders* does not relate the Story, becauſe his naming the particular Witneſſes might have been of dangerous Conſequence to thoſe Perſons, when any one may ſee, by looking upon *Sacroboſco* and *Champney*, that he might have told the ſame Story in full, as it is in them, only without naming the *Meſſenger* that *Bonner* ſent to *Landaff*, or ſaying any thing more of the Witneſſes than *Conſtable* does, *That the Account was atteſted by ſeveral Catholicks of very good Reputation, who were Eye-witneſſes of what was done?*

There is a third Reaſon given by the *Remarker* for the Author's not relating the Story, becauſe [d] *his loading the Objection of our Biſhops wanting Orders with the odious Circumſtances that attended it, might have drawn greate Severities upon Catholicks in general.* If *Sanders* uſed to ſhew ſo much Prudence and Caution, as to leave out, in his Relation of Perſons and Facts, the odious Circumſtances, the publiſhing whereof might have given Offence, and provoked the Government to treat the Catholicks with greater Severity; then there might be ſome Colour for this Pretence. But nothing appears more plainly than his never being under any ſuch Reſtraint, and I need give no more Inſtances than that which is mentioned above, his Story of Queen [e] *Anne Boleyn*'s Birth, Deformity, and ſcandalous Lewdneſs, and King *Henry*'s Marriage to her, doubly inceſtuous, as ſhe was his own Baſtard Daughter, and Siſter to one whom that King had debauched. Can there be any thing more odiouſly repreſented? Or could any thing more have provoked the Excellent *Queen*,

[d] P. 194. [e] Sup. p. 24.

whom

whom he intended to blacken and load with Diſgrace, as being born of ſuch Parents? provoked her, I ſay, to great Severity againſt thoſe of that Religion, if ſhe had not been of that Clemency as to let none of them ſuffer Death for their Religion, but for their making Rebellion and Treaſon againſt their Prince a part of their Duty to God and the Church. It is one of the Falſhoods of the Author, or of his Continuator *Riſhton*, that any Catholicks were uſed by her with ſuch Severity barely on account of their Religion; and *Riſhton*[f] himſelf is one out of more than ſeventy, who when their Lives were at Mercy for the ſame Treaſon that *Campian* was executed for, were ſent into Exile inſtead of ſuffering the Puniſhment of Traitors and Conſpirators againſt the Government; tho' *Riſhton*'s grateful Return for that Mercy was no other but to make it his firſt Buſineſs, after his being tranſported into *France*, to compleat and publiſh this Libel of *Sanders*'s, with his own Additions. Let me therefore aſk, Could the Author be ſo free and open in that odious Account of King *Henry* and Queen *Anne Boleyn*, without any fear of provoking their Royal Daughter to take ſome Revenge upon the Catholicks, and yet be ſo cautious and reſerved as not to dare to ſpeak out, when he had the whole Account of the profane Ordination of our firſt Biſhops lying before him, for fear of diſpleaſing them and the Queen, and bringing thoſe of his own Religion under Perſecution? How could his Conduct in theſe two Caſes be ſo different and contradictory to itſelf? Let us go a little farther, and conſider what elſe *Sanders* was doing at the time when the laſt Part of the Hiſtory of the *Engliſh Schiſm* lay upon his Hands, and he was

[f] Diarium rerum geſtarum in Turri Londinenſi, Jun. 21. A. 1585. ad finem Hiſtoriæ de Schiſm. Anglican.

(as

(as *Riſhton* ſays) prevented from finiſhing his Hiſtory, and publiſhing it in his Life-time, by his other Buſineſs not giving him Leiſure to attend that Work. What Buſineſs was it that then took up ſo much of his Time? He was, by Commiſſion from the Pope, employed in acting the Part of an Incendiary and Arch-Rebel, in exciting Queen *Elizabeth*'s Subjects in the Kingdom of *Ireland* to riſe up againſt her, and take the Crown from off her Head. In his *Perſuaſive to the Catholick Lords and Gentlemen of* Ireland (writ for that Purpoſe the Year before his Death) he gives her the Character of a "[g] *Wicked Woman*, neither begotten in true Wedlock, nor eſteeming her Chriſtendom, (that is, not regarding her being a Chriſtian——) forſaken of God—— of all Catholick Princes—— of divers Lords and Knights and Gentlemen of *England*—— an Heretical Pretenſed Queen—— ſuch a ſhameful Reproach to the Royal Crown, that whoſo is a Friend to the Crown ſhould ſo much the more haſten to diſpoſſeſs her of the ſame." To this Act of the higheſt Treaſon, with all the Rhetorick he is Maſter of, he conjures, ſhames, and threatens the *Iriſh* Nobility and Gentry, and drew in ſome of them to ſacrifice their Lives and Fortunes in that Attempt, which at laſt brought him to his own miſerable End. Is it poſſible for the ſame Man to be the Author of this *Perſuaſive*, and of the Account of the Ordination of our Biſhops? That in the one he ſhould ſo openly and audaciouſly affront the Majeſty of his Sovereign, and enlarge upon the odious Character under which he repreſents her; and in the other, take ſuch Care to diſſemble his Knowledge of the Fact, for fear of giving her any Provocation? That in the one,

[g] Strype's Life of Matth. Parker, Append. p. 119.

he ſhould be ſo earneſt to have all thoſe of his Religion join with him, at the utmoſt Peril of ending their Lives by the Sword or a Halter; and in the other, be ſo tender and careful of them that they may ſleep in a whole Skin? I may appeal to the *Remarker* himſelf, whether it is reaſonable to conceive, that *Sanders* was fully informed of the Conſecration at the Tavern, and all the odious Circumſtances of it, and yet out of ſo much Caution and Prudence not to give greater Offence than was neceſſary, concealed this odious Fact from the Eyes of the World, when he could neither be true to his Cauſe, or juſt to his Hiſtory of the *Engliſh Schiſm*, without giving a full Account of that moſt flagrant Act of it. And I hope the Reader is ſatisfied, upon what weak and frivolous Pretences the *Remarker* and *Le Quien* would make us believe, that this Author might be fully apprized of the Story, and yet might well omit the Relation of the Particulars upon *good Reaſons*.

CHAP.

CHAP. III.

Reflections upon Conſtable's *Account. Reflections upon* Sacroboſco's *Relation. The Courſe of the Hiſtory from its firſt Publication in* Sacroboſco, *down to the Time of* Champney's *Narrative. The Relation of the two next Writers after* Sacroboſco *contradictory to his Relation. The Diſagreement of the Writers in the Names and Number of the Perſons conſecrated. Their Diſagreement about the intended Conſecrators. Their Diſagreement about the actual Conſecrators, and the Ceremony of Conſecration. Summary of their Differences and Contradictions. No Certainty what was* Neal's *Account of the Story. An Expedient how to come to a Certainty.* Fitz-Simon's *Narrative determined to be the authentick Hiſtory by the Decree of Pope* Clement XI.

1. I Paſs on from *Sanders* to the proper Authors of the *Nag's-Head* Story, *Conſtable*, *Sacroboſco*, *Parſons*'s *Prefacer*, *Fitz-Simon*, *Wadſworth*, *Kelliſon*, and *Champney*. The firſt, as *Champney*[a] (and *Le Quien*[b] from him) gives us his Character, was a *Perſon of Quality of great Parts, Judgment, and Penetration, and one that would not be moved by light Conjectures.* This is to give ſome Credit to his *Account*; but the Account itſelf brings very little Credit to the Story, which it ſhews to be but newly invented, and not yet formed and licked into Shape, when it firſt peeped into the

Reflections upon Conſtable's *Account.*

[a] P. 501. [b] T. 1. p. 193.

World in his *Manuſcript*. If the Conſecration at the Tavern had been true and real Matter of Fact, it muſt have been compleat in all its Circumſtances at the time of the Action, and publick and notorious a little time after. Is it then poſſible that (beſides *Sanders*'s having no Account of it twenty years after) forty Years almoſt from the time, *A Perſon of Quality, Parts, and Judgment*, ſhould take upon him to write an [c] *Anſwer* to ſatisfy ſome Perſons who had enquired about the *Vocation and Conſecration of our Biſhops*, and yet have no more to ſay of the Fact than *Conſtable* had? *Le Quien* cannot help owning that he is not ([d] *auſſi circonſtantiè*) ſo full and particular in the Circumſtances as *Champney* and *Sacroboſco*; but pray why was he not, if there were a ſettled, full, and particular Tradition of the Story, almoſt forty Years before he took upon him to relate it, for the Satisfaction of thoſe who deſired to have from him an Account of the Tranſaction? And is it not ridiculous for this Gentleman, who knew ſo little himſelf of the Circumſtances of the Action, to tell thoſe to whom he writes, [e] *That* Stow *was a Witneſs of it, who diligently and thoroughly ſearched into all the Circumſtances of the Fact, tho' he durſt not relate them in his Chronicle.* Might he not have been as diligent and inquiſitive, and ſo have been informed of Particulars even from the Mouth of *Stow* himſelf? of whom tho' he ſays he durſt not put the Story in print, he does not mean that he kept it wholly to himſelf, but communicated it to confiding Perſons, *the Catholicks, to whom he uſed often to tell it*, as *Kelliſon* [f] ſays; tho', if it had been *conſtantly heard, credited, and related by the wiſe and ſober Men* of that Party, *from the Year* 1559, *Stow* muſt rather at firſt

[c] Sup. p. 8. [d] T. 1. p. 195. [e] Sup. ibid.
[f] Sup. p. 16.

have

have had it from them; and by his ſearching diligently and thoroughly into the Circumſtances, found it, as they would pretend, to be true. 'Tis unhappy that *Conſtable* was not inſtructed, either from him, or ſome Catholicks that had it from him, in one Circumſtance of the greateſt Importance, about which he leaves the Perſons he writ to in Suſpence, *viz.* Who were the Conſecrators of *Parker*, whether *Scory* alone, or *Barlow* with him, whereof he [g] owns himſelf *to be ignorant*; and is only poſitive that there were but theſe two *at the moſt*. He ſpeaks of *the Place deſigned for the Conſecration of* Parker *and the reſt*, without naming it, tho' *the Nag's-Head Tavern in Cheapſide* would have taken up leſs Room in his Letter than thoſe Words; and the very Name of ſuch a Place would have ſatisfied them to whom he writ, what kind of Mock-Conſecration our Biſhops muſt probably have had there. But that which would moſt affect the Credit of the Story, if it ſtood upon the Foundation of his Account, is, that he ſays it is atteſted by [h] *Catholicks* (*ſeveral* Catholicks he muſt mean) *of very good Reputation, who were Eye-witneſſes of what was done.* Were there then ſeveral Catholicks Eye-witneſſes? The only Ground they have for making our Biſhops attempt to get themſelves ordained in that Place, and in that Manner, is the Neceſſity they ſuppoſe them to be under to have the Ordination clancular and private. And could they have that Deſign, to ſteal a private and clandeſtine Ordination, and yet leave the Door open for ſeveral Catholicks to be Eye-witneſſes? This is deſigning it to be private and concealed, and yet deſigning it to be publick and notorious to all Comers. In this Particular, 'tis plain all the Writers after *Conſtable* are fain to leave him,

[g] Sup. p. 8, [h] Ibid.

and think it enough if they can make it paſs with their Readers, that one ſuch Eye-witneſs as *Neal* might find a way to get Admittance into the Place, to be a Spy upon the Perſons concerned, to ſtay and be preſent at the Conſecration, to ſee and hear all that was ſaid or done, and to make a full Diſcovery of all to his own Party. *Le Quien* [i] cannot but take notice, that *Conſtable does not vouch* Neal *for his Warrant*, but ſays he reports it as a Fact *whereof there was more than one Eye-witneſs*; and if the Biſhops can be ſuppoſed to receive their Order in ſuch a manner, and yet to have ſo little Conduct as to admit of more Eye-witneſſes than one (more than two or three, as *Conſtable*'s Words may be fairly interpreted) and not to look about them and ſee that there were none preſent, but ſuch *Baal*'s Prieſts as themſelves, none of the Catholick Worſhippers there; they muſt be concluded to have had as little of common Senſe, as the Fable ſuppoſes them to have had of Religion. But if ſuch a Suppoſition is too groſs to be admitted, then *Conſtable*'s and *Le Quien*'s Judgment and Penetration may be called in queſtion, for telling the Story with ſuch a Circumſtance as makes it impoſſible for a Man of Senſe or Reaſon to believe it to be true. The Reader, if he looks upon *Le Quien*, will obſerve farther, that the *Father* takes care to aſſure us, that [k] *Conſtable*'s Relation agrees perfectly with *Champney* and *Sacroboſco*; and yet, ſetting aſide other Differences, thoſe two Authors ſpeak not a Word of any other Eye-witneſs but *Neal*; and without any *if* or *and* make *Scory*, without *Barlow*, the only Conſecrator. So perfectly does *Champney*, *Sacroboſco*, and *Conſtable* agree; or rather, ſo little does *Le Quien*'s confident Aſſertion, to poſſeſs his Readers with the Belief of there be-

[i] P. 195. [k] P. 194, 195.

ing

ing a perfect Harmony between theſe Writers, agree with the Truth of the Matter. What he ſays, however, is of good Uſe, as it ſhews him to be under a Conviction, that the Credit and Authority of the Story requires that there ſhould be ſuch an Agreement between the Relations we have of it in the ſeveral Authors; but if it be brought to this Teſt, I have ſhewed already, and it will more and more appear as we proceed, that it muſt be given up for a Fable, as inconſiſtent with and contradictory to itſelf.

2. The Time when *Conſtable* writ was (as we may take it from [l] *Le Quien*) about the end of the ſixteenth Century; tho' there is one who has the Confidence to ſay, [m] *That he writ and particularly deſcribed the whole Story in the beginning of Queen* Elizabeth's *Reign*, and that *his Relation was writ when the Story happened*; and it is as true that he writ it at that Time, as it is that *he particularly deſcribed the whole Story*. But the Deſcription of the whole was firſt attempted in the beginning of the following Century, *Ann.* 1603, when *F. Chriſtoph. Holywood*, or *Sacroboſco*, publiſhed his Relation of it. The Story by that Time, in ſix or ſeven Years after *Conſtable* offer'd at it, had received ſome Growth and Improvement, and is preſented to the World by this Writer more *circonſtantiè*, (to borrow a Word from *Le Quien*) that is, more full and particular; and *Sacroboſco* looked upon himſelf as ſo well qualified to write a compleat Narrative of it, that he calls it an Account of the *Original of the* Engliſh *Miniſtry*. But this *Iriſh* Hiſtorian appears to be a Stranger to the Tradition in *Conſtable*'s MS., otherwiſe he would have known better what was the Title of the [n] *Old*

Reflections upon Sacroboſco's *Relation.*

[l] P. 193. [m] Nullity of the Prelat. Clergy, &c. p. 61, 76. [n] Sup. p. 9.

Simple Biſhop, whom he brings to the *Nag's-Head* together with our Prelates to be their Conſecrator, and four times calls him *Laudaſenſis* inſtead of *Landavenſis*, which Blunder had almoſt led Biſhop *Bedell* [o] into a Miſtake (obſerving that Page of *Sanders* cited in the Margin where he ſpeaks of the *Iriſh* Arch-Biſhop) and made him think the *Iriſh* Jeſuit ſpoke of ſome *Iriſh* Biſhop under that Title. The blind Account he had of our Affairs was the Occaſion of this *Miſnomer* and two others, of *Bomer* for *Bonner*, and *Bancraſt* for *Bancroft*; and of his talking ſo much at random of the Eccleſiaſtical Conſtitution, as to make the Biſhop of *London Dean of all the Biſhops in England*, with Authority to excommunicate *Landaffe* if he preſumed to ordain our Prelates contrary to his Order by his Chaplain. However, he of all the Writers, has the beſt Title to be believed implicitly (with all his Miſtakes) being (as we are aſſured by a confident Writer cited already) [p] a Man, beſides his *eminent Virtue*, endewed with *ſupernatural Gifts*, by which that Writer means the Spirit of Prophecy, and pretends to give an Inſtance of it.

The Courſe of the Hiſtory from its firſt Publication by Sacroboſco, *down to the time of* Champney's *Narrative.*

3. In the ſame Year when *Sacroboſco* publiſhed his Book *de inveſtigandâ Chriſti Eccleſiâ*, *Kelliſon* printed the firſt Edition of his *Survey of the New Religion:* And the Story might have been expected from him as well as *Sacroboſco*, *Kelliſon* being no mean Author, and his Work of ſo great Importance as to encourage him to preſume to dedicate it to King *James* I. to give that Prince, preſently after his Acceſſion to the Crown of *England*, a View of the State of our Church and Religion. Yet when he comes to be upon the Subject of

[o] Letters between Wadſworth and Bedell, p. 142, 143.
[p] Nullity of the Prelatick Clergy, &c. p. 65.

our

our Want of a Miniſtry [q], we hear nothing from him of the *Nag's-Head* Ordination. He might be thought to look that way, in the latter Place refer'd to in the Margin, where he names *Parker*, *Grindall*, *Horne* and *Sands*, for ſome of their *Apoſtate Prieſts* (as he calls them) that we were forced *to make Superintendents of our Church*, and ſays, they *had no Conſecration from Catholick Biſhops or Biſhops of their own*, but *were thought fit Paſte to make ſuch Superintendents without any new moulding or kneading*. But if any one pretends to find the Tavern-Ordination in that Place, the Author himſelf ſufficiently confutes that Surmiſe. For firſt, in another Edition of his *Survey*, two Years after, with *Additions*, in one of them he owns that, for ought he knew at that Time, we might have a Succeſſion of Biſhops from ſome that had received the Order from Biſhops of their Church, and after that left their Church and ordained others. His Words, ſoon after thoſe above cited, are, [r] *They will ſay peradventure that their firſt Biſhops, Prieſts, and Preachers, were ordained by ours, before they departed from us, and that they ordaining others ſtill continued the Succeſſion.* And in Anſwer to this he offers nothing to diſprove the Fact, but ſays only that [s] *thoſe that were Biſhops uſed not the right Form of Ordination, and ſo they alſo made no true Prieſts, but only profane Miniſters.* Secondly, in his *Reply* to *Sutcliffe's* Anſwer to the *Survey*, three Years after, *A.* 1608. he ſpeaks, as of a piece of News lately come to his Ears, "[t] That he had heard it credibly re- "ported that *ſome of them* (our New Superinten- "dents) were made Biſhops at the *Nag's-Head*; a "fit Church for ſuch a Conſecration." Let any

[q] Book 1. p. 10, 11. B. 4. p. 373. p. 6. See B. 4. c. 1. n. 6. p. 204. p. 204. Reply to Sutclyffe, f. 31.

[r] B. 1. c. 1. n. 9.

[s] B. 1. p. 7. B. 4.

[t] Fol. 31.

one now judge, by this Author's having no better Information of it before the Year 1608; by his ſaying firſt, that our Biſhops, *Parker*, *&c.* were made without any Conſecration; then, two Years after, allowing that they might have been conſecrated by ſome that derived their Orders from the *Roman* Church; then, in three Years more, telling the World that he had heard it probably *reported* that they were made Biſhops at the *Nag's-Head:* Let any one judge from hence, whether it could be a Fact known, publick, and notorious, and delivered down by a conſtant Tradition from the Year 1559; and not rather a late Invention, beginning then, forty Years after the pretended time, to be propagated among the Party that were diſpoſed to believe and divulge it.

The very ſame Year in which *Kelliſon* publiſhed this *Report*, *Peter à Cudſem*, firſt a Proteſtant at *Weſel*, but then, or ſoon after, of the Communion of the Church of *Rome*, had taken a Journey over into *England*, on purpoſe to inform himſelf of the State of our Church and Univerſities. His Report of what he had obſerved he makes two Years after his Return, when he printed a Book *De deſperatâ Calvini causâ*; that is, *Of the hopeleſs Condition of the Reformed Churches*; of whom, as the reſt of their Authors do, he ſpeaks as if they all had *Calvin* for their *Founder*. But however, he owns that the Condition of the [v] *Calviniſt* Sect in *England* was not ſo deſperate, becauſe they had *retained the Catholick Order in a perpetual Line of their Biſhops, and a lawful Succeſſion of their Paſtors received from the Church.*

[v] Cap. 11. Quod Calvinianæ Sectæ in Angliâ ſtatum attinet, ille ita comparatus eſt, ut vel admodùm longo tempore durare poſſit, vel etiam ſubitò & repentè mutari; propter Catholicum in perpetuâ Epiſcoporum ſuorum Serie, legitimâque Paſtorum Succeſſione ab Eccleſiâ acceptâ, Ordinem, p. 108. See Maſon's Vindiciæ, p. 14.

We

We ſee here the Reſult of his Enquiries about the State of the Church of *England:* And can it be ſuppoſed that a Man, who probably came over with Expectations to ſee the Nakedneſs and the hopeleſs Condition of it, ſhould give this Account when he came back from a Place where our ſcandalous Ordination had been (as they ſay) for ſo long time publick and notorious? To whom muſt we ſuppoſe him to have addreſſed himſelf for Information, in what he wanted to diſcover? Muſt it not be to them who, if this Fact were publickly known, would not have failed to give him a full Account of it? Either therefore they had not a Word to tell him of it, or whatſoever Story they had, he found they had no Grounds for it, but that the contrary appeared from the Publick Records in the Church and State. It cannot be conceived that he would affirm, that we had *a continued Line of Biſhops*, upon no better Grounds than that he ſaw in *England* ſome Perſons that took upon them to bear the Name, and to wear the Habit, and to execute the Offices, without any Aſſurance that thoſe Perſons had the Epiſcopal Character tranſmitted to them by a lawful Succeſſion. We muſt ſuppoſe therefore that he took care to be fully ſatisfied, by a Sight of our Publick Acts, our Records and Regiſters, and returned from *England* without any the leaſt Doubt of our having that Succeſſion which he poſitively affirms we had; and, judiciouſly enough, infers from it, that by vertue of that Succeſſion our Church may either *continue a very long time*, (as, God be thanked, has been, and we hope will always be the Caſe) or be *changed very ſuddenly*; he means if (what God forbid) we ſhould be brought back again to the Communion of the Church and See of *Rome*; to which he looked upon us as ſo much the nearer, becauſe we ſhould not ſtand in need of a Re-Ordination of our Biſhops and Clergy.

If

If we ſuppoſe that *A. Cudſem*, either in his Way to *England*, or Return from hence, viſited the *Engliſh* Seminaries beyond Sea, and met there with the ſame Report that *Kelliſon* had, the Event ſhews that he was fully ſatisfied, by the Information he had here, that there was nothing of Truth in it. And from this Account, of *Kelliſon*'s knowing ſo little of the Matter at this time, and *Cudſem*'s either never hearing a Word of it, or at leaſt finding that the Fact was quite contrary, we ſee how little Credit the Story had gained from *Conſtable*'s or *Sacroboſco*'s time.

Four Years after, *Ann.* 1612. *Parſons*'s *Diſcuſſion* was printed, with a Preface of the Editor; and he, tho' the Author himſelf has nothing, in that or any other Book of his, of the Tavern-Ordination, takes upon him, in his Preface, to give the World the Story at length as he had it; and yet neither had he his Leſſon ſo perfectly, but that he is afraid he may be guilty of ſome [x] *Miſtake in the Names of the Perſons conſecrated*; as indeed he is, by leaving out the principal Perſon, Arch-Biſhop *Parker*, and putting the Conſecrator *Scory* among thoſe that were to be conſecrated: Beſides another Miſtake of greater Conſequence, if *Sacroboſco*'s Account was right, his making the intended Conſecrator, the Biſhop of *Landaff*, to have been only *expected* at the Tavern, but never to come to the Meeting there; ſo that in paſſing from *Sacroboſco* down to him, half the Tradition, at leaſt, appears to be loſt. And the like Appearance it has in [y] *Fitz-Simon*, (*Ann.* 1614.) and in [z] *Kelliſon* two Years after, who do not tell us that *Landaff* was ſo much as *expected* at the Meeting; and by their never bringing that Biſhop and *Bonner*'s Chaplain *Neale* together at the Place, they and the *Prefacer* to

[x] Sup. p. 10. [y] Sup. p. 13. [z] Sup. p. 15.

Parſons

Parſons deprive *Neale* of any Opportunity of being preſent at the Conference between *Landaff* and our Prelates, or at *Scory*'s performing the Ceremony of Conſecration; and ſo, by their lame and imperfect Account, *Neale* is diſqualified for his Office of Principal Notary, and Grand Eye-witneſs of the whole Tranſaction.

Champney indeed, when he comes after them, [a] recovers that Part of the Tradition which was dropt in thoſe Writers, and relates the Story in full, as one that was perfectly inſtructed in the whole Matter. Yet by his way of expreſſing himſelf, a little before he comes to his Relation, he ſhews either a want of Memory or Reflection, or that he had no ſuch certain Knowledge or full Aſſurance of what he is going to relate. The Hiſtory is in his fourteenth Chapter; but in the Chapter before, he had been very long in reciting *Harding*'s Diſpute with *Jewell*, and comes at laſt, about the End of that Chapter, to the very *ſharp cutting Reply* (as he calls it) that *Harding* makes to *Jewell*'s Words (" Our Biſhops are conſecrated " by an Arch-Biſhop and three Biſhops") " That " *our Metropolitan, the Arch-Biſhop himſelf, had* " *no lawful Conſecration.*" To which Reply of his Adverſary, *Jewell*, [b] *being convicted*, he ſays, *of the Truth of it*, never offered to make any *Rejoinder*. *Champney's* Words are, [c] *It appears moſt plainly, from his ſo wilfully diſſembling the Objection, that* Parker *either was not conſecrated at all, or that it was done at the* Nag's-Head, (*as I ſhall*, he ſays, *after relate*) *or in ſome other Way which* Jewell *durſt not own, for fear of expoſing himſelf to be the more inſulted upon by his Adverſary*. Could he be certain of the Fact (*which* he ſays *he is going to relate*) that *Parker* was conſecrated at the Tavern; and yet be no more poſitive in this Place, but only

[a] Sup. p. 17. [b] P. 467. [c] P. 468.

that

that his *Conſecration was either done there, or in ſome other ſhameful manner*, or *that he had no Conſecration at all*; that is, was made Biſhop without any Ceremony? If, as it appears, for ought he knew, *Parker* was conſecrated *ſome other Way*, and not at the Tavern, how could he pretend to any certain Knowledge of the Tavern-Conſecration? So well he ſhews himſelf before-hand to be qualified to give us the following Hiſtory, as undoubted Matter of Fact, and not rather as an uncertain Report, tho' current then with ſome of the Party.

How certainly and univerſally it was known and believed by the Catholicks, the Year before *Champney* writ, and in that very Year, appears from *Wadſworth*, and the Author of the *Proteſtant Demonſtration*. The former, in his Letter, *A.* 1615. ſhews he had no better Information, than that there was an [d] *Attempt* to conſecrate *Parker* at that Tavern, but without Effect; but owns that he knew he was afterwards actually conſecrated at *Lambeth*, and had ſeen the Account of his Conſecration in the *Regiſter*. The latter, writing at the ſame time as *Champney*, *Ann.* 1616. tho' he takes upon him to deſtroy the Authority of the *Lambeth* Regiſter, yet either was not well enough apprized of the Conſecration at the *Nag's-Head*, or had no Inclination to ſpeak a word of it, for Reaſons beſt known to himſelf; but places our firſt Biſhops in their Sees without any other Inveſtiture but only from the Authority of Queen *Elizabeth*'s Letters Patents.

Such as this, as has been ſhewed, was the Progreſs of the Hiſtory and Tradition, from the time that it was put in print by the firſt Author *Sacroboſco*, till it was completed, and left to ſtand upon Record, in the laſt Relator *Champney*.

[d] Sup. p. 14.

4. If

4. If the Story had been tranſmitted down to Poſterity in no other Writer but *Sacroboſco*, or if no other had taken it in hand to relate it after him but *Champney*, (who tho' he does not wholly agree with him, yet makes his Narrative the Ground of his own, only with ſome ſmall Improvements,) it would not be diſcovered to be a Fable by the Diſagreement of the Authors with one another: But now it will appear that the Credit of it is plainly deſtroyed by the very Inconſiſtency of the Story with itſelf, in the ſeveral Relations. It falls out pleaſantly (*perridiculè*, to borrow the Expreſſion from *Sanders*) that the two firſt after *Sacroboſco*, the Author of the *Preface* to *Parſons*, and *Fitz-Simon*, give us ſuch an Account of the Fact, that if we believe theirs to be true and authentick, we muſt give up his as *Apocryphal* and *Fabulous*. His Relation [e] begins with the Meeting of the Biſhops to be conſecrated, at the *Nag's-Head* Tavern, and *Landaff*'s coming with them to be their Conſecrator, and upon the foot of his and their coming together to that Place for that Purpoſe, almoſt all the reſt of his Story proceeds, of *Bonner*'s hearing of it, and ſending his Chaplain thither with a thundring Meſſage to *Landaff*, the Old Biſhop's being ſtartled at it, and declining thereupon to perform the Office, and the *Candidates* for Conſecration being provoked by the Diſappointment to abuſe and revile him, which Paſſage *Champney* improves, by putting a Speech into their Mouths ſuitable to the Purpoſe. But what will become of all this fine Piece of Hiſtory, if *Parſons*'s *Prefacer* and *Fitz-Simon* are to be credited, in whom the plain Contradiction to it ſtands upon Record? The *Prefacer* to *Parſons* [f] ſays they met there, and waited for the

The Relation of the two next Writers after Sacroboſo, *inconſiſtent with and contradictory to his Relation.*

[e] Sup. p. 9. [f] Sup. p. 10, 11.

Biſhop of *Landaff* a long time, but he diſappointed them, and came not to the Place, and they were obliged to get the Office performed by *Scory*. *Fitz-Simon* [g] ſays, they appointed the Meeting at the *Nag's-Head*, *between themſelves*, after both *Landaff* had refuſed to execute his Commiſſion from the Queen, and an *Iriſh* Arch-Biſhop to whom they applied themſelves had denied them; and then, when they were met, choſe *Scory* to be their Conſecrator. Here we ſee, on the one hand, that *Landaff* accompanied them to the Place; on the other, that he diſappointed them, and never came thither: That he came to the Meeting, and at laſt refuſed to do what he came for; on the contrary, that there was no Meeting till he had given them a Refuſal. So that, to proſecute the Matter, *Bonner*'s Chaplain *Neale* muſt have come to him to the Tavern, and delivered his Meſſage to him there, and carried his Point; and yet the Biſhop was not there for *Neale* to come to: And the *Candidates* muſt expoſtulate with the Biſhop upon the Place, and treat him there with great Rudeneſs, and yet he never be there at all, to deſerve or receive ſuch Affronts from them. So we ſee what Credit the Story, as it ſtood in the firſt Author, gets when it comes into the Hands of the ſecond and third.

And yet all theſe three Writers are, it is probable, of the ſame celebrated *Order*, and one would think they ſhould have writ under the Direction of their *Superiors*, and the two latter would have been required, for the Honour of the *Society*, as well as the Credit of the Story, to copy after the firſt Author, rather than to give him the Lye, and to make it impoſſible for their Readers to believe there is any Truth in the Hiſtory, if they muſt take it both from him and them.

[g] Sup. p. 13.

In this Poſture of Agreement the Story ſtood, in *Sacroboſco*, *Parſon*'s *Prefacer*, and *Fitz-Simon*, for two Years after *Fitz-Simon* had writ his Narrative of it; at which time *Champney*, tho' he writ his *Engliſh* Work ſo ſoon after the two laſt, comes in his turn to relate the Fact, as one who was well perſuaded that himſelf, as they had pleaſed to ſet aſide *Sacroboſco*, was as much at Liberty not to dance after their Pipe; and accordingly [h] revives again *Sacroboſco*'s whole Story of *Landaff*, with a little Enlargement. But *Kelliſon* [i], at the ſame time, has not a Word of that Biſhop, but only of the *Iriſh* Arch-Biſhop, and ſends our Biſhops immediately to *Scory*, as ſoon as they had waited upon that Arch-Biſhop and met with a Repulſe. *Wadſworth*, on the contrary, where he ſpeaks of an Attempt to have our firſt Biſhops conſecrated at the *Nag's-Head*, and that there was [k] *but one Biſhop* there, muſt be underſtood to mean *Landaff* by that one Biſhop, upon whom the Attempt was made, to prevail with him to give them the Order.

The Author of the *Preface* to *Parſons*, *Fitz-Simon*, and *Kelliſon*, tho' they are pleaſed thus to drop *Sacroboſco*, yet think it proper to refer their Readers to him, and either in their Text or Margin quote the very Place in his Book *De inveſtigandâ Chriſti Eccleſiâ*, where his Narrative ſtands. So wiſe are they to vouch an Author to countenance and confirm their own Stories, whoſe Credit and Authority they plainly deſtroy, by ſetting aſide and contradicting the greateſt part of his Relation.

5. This Stumbling-block lies in our Way in the very Entrance upon the Hiſtory, and it would be a fair Excuſe for proceeding no farther, if the Reader

The Diſagreement of the Writers in the Names and Numbers of the Per-

[h] Sup. p. 17. [i] P. 15. [k] P. 14.

ſons conſecrated.

Reader might not have hopes to find a better Agreement between theſe Writers in the Sequel and Concluſion. Let him therefore go on and ſatisfy himſelf in the Particulars, and be a Witneſs of the Harmony there is in their Narrations. Would he know firſt who were the Perſons that wanted to be conſecrated, and received Conſecration at the *Nag's-Head? Sacroboſco*, tho' he was ſo ready at the Name of the Place of Conſecration, yet either had not been informed who were the Perſons conſecrated there, or thought that Circumſtance not ſo material as to oblige him to ſet down their Names. The *Prefacer* to *Parſons*, nine Years after, attempts to ſupply that Omiſſion, and names [l] *Jewell*, *Sands*, *Scory*, *Horne* and *Grindall*, and ſpeaks of others not named. *Fitz-Simon*, in a little better Order, gives us theſe four Names [m], *Parker*, *Grindall*, *Horne*, *Sands*; and ſays *Scory* conſecrated the reſt after them. *Kelliſon*, tho' he had named the ſame four, as the *Apoſtate Prieſts* who were made our firſt *Superintendents*, in his *Survey*, *Ann.* 1603. and in another Edition of it, *Ann.* 1605. yet in his *Reply* to *Sutclyffe*, *Ann.* 1608. he ſays only that he had heard that *ſome of them* were made Biſhops at the *Nag's-Head*, and in his *Examen Novæ Reformationis*, *Ann.* 1616. does not offer to name any of them. *Champney*, if we look into his firſt Edition in *Engliſh* (cited by Mr. *Maſon* [n]) propoſes firſt to give an Account of the whole Order of the Conſecration of all our firſt Biſhops; then ſoon after he ſays, there *met at the Nag's-Head all that were nominated to the Biſhopricks then vacant, whether by Death, as* (he ſays) *only the See of* Canterbury, (but ſhould have ſaid ſeveral more, eſpecially the Biſhoprick of *Saliſbury*, to which *Jewell* was very early nominated

[l] Sup. p. 10. [m] Sup. p. 13. [n] De Miniſterio Anglicano, p. 345.

and

and elected) *or by unjuſt Deprivation as all the reſt were, whoſe Names,* he ſays, *are ſet down in the next Chapter.* And there he gives the Names of [o] *fourteen* of our Biſhops put into the Sees of as many of theirs who had been deprived. This plainly ſhews what Number he means, when he ſays [p] *they all* knelt down before *Scory* and he laid the Bible upon each of their Heads or Shoulders, *&c.* they all, that is *Parker*, together with the other *fourteen*. *Conſtable*, the firſt that offered at the Story, mentions only *Parker* as ordained, tho' he ſays, *the Place was deſigned for the Conſecration of him and the reſt.* And *Wadſworth* ſpeaks only of *Parker*'s Conſecration effected at *Lambeth*, and therefore may be ſuppoſed to mean that the ſame was *attempted* before at the *Nag's-Head*, but not *effected*.

This is the exact and particular information from theſe Writers, both as to the Number and the Names of the Perſons conſecrated: And the Reader ſees what certainty there is from their concurrent Teſtimony, which agrees no better than Arch-Biſhop *Bramhall* tells us. [q] "*Wadſworth* "ſays there was an Attempt to conſecrate Arch-"Biſhop *Parker*; others ſay there was more than "an Attempt, that one or more of them were "actually ordained, but name none: Others "name ſome, but they accord not one with an-"other in the naming of them. Some ſay *Jewel*, "*Sands*, *Horne*, *Grindall*, where was Arch-Biſhop "*Parker*: Others ſay *Parker*, *Grindall*, *Horne*, "*Sands*. Laſtly, ſome ſay they were all or-"dained there who were named to Biſhopricks, "and number fifteen of them." The Writer of the *Nullity of the Prelatick Clergy* (who we are aſſured by F. *Le Quien* [r] confutes *Bramhall ſolidly*

[o] P. 532. [p] Sup. p. 18. [q] Op. p. 437. [r] T. 1. Pref. p. lii. c. 1. p. 8.

from Point to Point) aſks upon this Head, Why [f] *Bramhall does not name thoſe others and ſome?* and ſays, *he has ſought their Authors that write of this Matter, and finds not thoſe ſome and others.* This is agreeable to that Writer's uſual Veracity, who is falſe either in ſaying that he looked into thoſe Authors, or in denying that he found in them that which he could not but ſee if his Eyes were open. *Sacroboſco*, and *Kelliſon* in his *Latin* Work, *name none: Parſons*'s Prefacer and *Fitz-Simon* name *ſome*, but without any *Accord* in the naming of them: The former names *Jewell*, *Sands*, (*Scory Bramhall* omits as the Conſecrator) *Horne*, and *Grindall*, and leaves out *Parker*; the latter (as *Kelliſon* did at firſt in his *Engliſh Survey*) makes them *Parker*, *Grindall*, *Horne* and *Sands*: *Champney*, who comes laſt, names the whole fifteen. Are not theſe the *Authors that write of this Matter?* How then can the confident Author of the *Nullity*, &c. affirm that he had *ſought* but did not *find* this Diſagreement in them? It may be he meant no more than this Cavil, that *Bramhall* ſhould not always have uſed the Plural Number, but ſhould have ſaid One and Another, inſtead of Some and Others; becauſe (tho' the Number is double in the other Inſtances) yet *Champney* ſtands ſingle, and appears to be the only Author that numbers fifteen. If this Trifle ſhould be granted him, that it would have been proper to have ſaid in relation to *Champney*, *One ſays they were all ordained there—and numbers fifteen*; muſt what he ſays paſs for a Diſproof of that which the Biſhop had ſaid of their Diſagreement? Take them ſeverally, and then compare them together, is it not plainly to be objected againſt their Account of the Perſons conſecrated, that they diſagree in the Names, and Number, and the Diſproportion is

[f] P. 59.

from

from one, in *Conſtable*, upwards to fifteen in *Champney?*

And yet to this round Number of fifteen (more by half than he might have known were ſo much as *nominated and elected to the vacant Biſhopricks*; and 'tis only ſuch of our Prelates whom he brings to the *Nag's-Head* to be conſecrated) he ſhould, to agree with the other Writers, and to be conſiſtent with himſelf, have added at leaſt two or three more. As firſt *Jewell*, whom he could not well forget, becauſe he is named by *Parſons*'s Prefacer, and beſides was one of the firſt who were nominated by the Queen, and elected by the Chapters: But he was nominated and elected to a See vacant by Death and not by Deprivation, and *Champney*, it appears, knew no better than that no more but the See of *Canterbury* was vacant by Death (tho' there were no fewer than [t] nine or ten more void by the Deceaſe of the former Biſhops) and this Miſtake led him not to think of *Jewell*, elected, in the room of *Capon* deceaſed, to the Biſhoprick of *Salisbury*. But beſides *Jewell*, he ſhould have named two others, who likewiſe were of the firſt that were nominated and elected, *Scory* the Biſhop Elect of *Hereford*, and *Barlow* the Elect of *Chicheſter*; and the former, *Scory*, is expreſsly declared by *Sacroboſco* and *Fitz-Simon* to have been himſelf ordained at the Tavern, by ſome of thoſe who had been juſt before ordained by him. Here theſe two Writers, and the others before or after them, do not agree: *Conſtable* has not a Word of it, nor *Kelliſon*, nor *Parſons*'s Prefacer (except he had that Meaning when he firſt named *Scory* with *Jewell*, *Sands*, *&c.*) for tho' he ſays *Scory* gave them the Order, yet he does not (as the other Two) go on and ſay, that ſome of them returned the Kindneſs, and riſing up re-ordained *Scory*.

[t] Strype's Annals, P. I. p. 154, 155.

Neither has *Champney* any thing of it in his Narrative, but afterwards, rather than own *Scory* for a true Biſhop, he ſays, [u] from *Sacroboſco*, that he had no Conſecration but that at the *Nag's-Head*. What muſt we do to learn the Truth from ſuch Writers? *Champney* is ſilent in the Place, where he ought to have told this Part of the Story as well as the reſt. How comes he then to paſs it by there, and to give us this Intimation of it afterwards? If he believed it when he ſaw it in *Sacroboſco*, why did he not in Concurrence with him give it a Place in his own Relation? There being nothing of more Weight than this Circumſtance, to expoſe and ridicule the Mock-Conſecration. If he did not believe it, why does he affirm it afterwards, upon *Sacroboſco*'s Word, who had ſaid it before him? Except he thought, tho' he could not ſtand by that Writer in this Particular, it might be of ſervice to the Cauſe to let it paſs upon the Reader, whether it were true, or tho' it were falſe. But let it be taken either as from him alſo, or only from the other Two, if we credit them, *Scory* muſt be added to the Number of the Perſons conſecrated. And ſo ſhould *Barlow*, as he was nominated and elected, very early with the firſt, to the vacant See of *Chicheſter*; and in the Opinion of *Champney* and the reſt, had never received Epiſcopal Conſecration before; ſo that if all that were nominated and elected met (as he ſays) at the Tavern to be conſecrated, *Barlow*, if ever he was made Biſhop, muſt be one of thoſe that received the Order there; that is, he either was ordained by *Scory* amongſt them, or firſt (as *Conſtable* gives us leave to think he might) joined with *Scory* in ordaining the reſt, and then they riſing up from their Knees, he and *Scory* knelt down and were conſecrated by ſome of them, and

[u] P. 507.

ſo

ſo the *Fathers* (as they expreſs it) *were begotten by their own Sons.*

6. We may next enquire how they agree about the Perſon to whom our Prelates applied themſelves for Conſecration. *Sanders*, without being able to tell any thing more of the Story, ſays they waited upon an *Iriſh* Arch-Biſhop then Priſoner in *London*. *Sacroboſco*, tho' he refers to the Page of *Sanders*'s Hiſtory, yet takes no notice of this Arch-Biſhop, but makes the Perſon to be the Biſhop of *Landaff*, who came together with them to the Place, and upon their being there together moſt part of his Relation depends. With him *Conſtable*, *Parſons*'s *Prefacer*, and *Champney*, agree. But *Fitz-Simon* and *Kelliſon* think it better to follow *Sanders*, and make the *Iriſh* Arch-Biſhop the Perſon they addreſſed themſelves to, tho' the former owns *Landaff* was commiſſioned in the firſt place by Queen *Elizabeth*, but refuſed to execute that Commiſſion. This Difference may be accommodated, if we take in both *Landaff* and the *Iriſh* Arch-Biſhop, and make the Candidates for Conſecration apply themſelves firſt to the one, and then, upon his declining it, to the other. Their *Poet Ward* [w], who puts the Fable into the beſt Order that he can, ſends them to both; but firſt to the Arch-Biſhop in the *Tower*, and then from him to *Landaff*, at his Houſe. But it will not be practicable to bring the Authors to an Agreement in this Particular. If, as *Fitz-Simon* and *Kelliſon* have it, they went immediately to *Scory* upon the Arch-Biſhop's Refuſal, then they muſt either not go to *Landaff* at all, or have gone to him firſt, before the Arch-Biſhop: It is the contrary, if, as *Parſons*'s *Prefacer* ſays, they treated with *Scory* at the Tavern upon *Landaff*'s failing

Their Diſagreement about the Perſons intended to be the Conſecrators.

[w] Reformation, Canto II.

to come thither; or if, as *Conſtable*, *Sacroboſco*, and *Champney* have it, *Landaff* and they and *Scory* were all together upon the Spot, and, upon *Landaff*'s declaring himſelf to be unable to perform the Office, at their Requeſt *Scory* undertook it. This Difficulty we muſt leave to be unriddled by F. *Le Quien*, or ſome other *Œdipus* of the Party, how theſe two Biſhops were both of them the firſt, and both of them the laſt, and were applied to by the Perſons to be conſecrated, and gave them a denial, each of them both before, and after, one another.

It would create us more Trouble, if we ſhould go ſo low, as to admit of a later Diſcovery, of a third intended Conſecrator, *Oglethorp* Biſhop of *Carliſle*, whom we are told they applied themſelves to, and were almoſt as near compaſſing their Deſign as they were in the Attempt upon *Landaff*, but came off at laſt with no better Succeſs. This we have from two hands, about the ſame time; firſt, in an Author entituled, *A Legacy left to Proteſtants*, printed *Ann.* 1654. then in a Book entituled, *Meditations upon the Marks of the True Church of Chriſt*, by *H. W. Ann.* 1655. The former [x] has his Story from a Letter of *Bonner*'s to Arch-Biſhop *Heath*, *ſent from the* Marſhalſea, *and* delivered *by one of* Bonner's *Chaplains, which a certain Gentleman's Father, Chief Juſtice of this Kingdom, ſaw and heard read while he and* Heath *were at Dinner together*; *wherein* Bonner *merrily related how theſe New Biſhops, becauſe he had diſſuaded* Oglethorp, *Biſhop of* Carliſle, *from doing it in his Dioceſe, ordained one another at an Inn, where they were met together.* If this Tale be admitted, it plainly ſets aſide all *Landaff*'s Part in the Hiſtory; except it can be thought poſſible for *Bonner*, juſt before the Ordi-

[x] Strype's Life of Matth. Parker, p. 59.

nation,

nation, to have frightned *Landaff* from performing the Ceremony, and, preſently after it, to ſend *Heath* the News, how they had been forced to ordain one another by his good Addreſs in perſuading *Oglethorp* not to ordain them, without a Word of his laſt and greater piece of Service, in denouncing an *Anathema* to *Landaff*, when he was almoſt at the Point of giving them the Order, if *Bonner*'s Meſſage had not come juſt in time to prevent him. So wiſe was the Author of this Tale, as to think it would be a pretty *Addition* to the *Nag's-Head* Story, when it utterly ruins the Credit of the greateſt Part of it.

The Letter to *Heath*, after the Ordination, was dated and ſent to him from the *Marſhalſea*; the Meſſage to *Landaff* before, was ſent from the *Tower*; this requires us to believe either that there were Two *Bonners*, or the ſame *Bonner* muſt have been confined, at or very near the ſame Point of time, in both thoſe Priſons. But wherever he was, the Writers might very well be allowed to take it for granted, that he would be very forward and zealous to prevent the Ordination of theſe Anti-Biſhops, if they could but give us a tolerable Account how he came, at the very Inſtant, to be apprized of the Meeting at the Tavern between *Landaff* and them. *Sacroboſco* ſays they met, and as ſoon as *Bonner underſtood it, he ſent from the Tower, &c.* and *Champney*, in his *Engliſh* Edition, ſays they met, and it being known to *Bonner*, then Priſoner, he ſent to the Biſhop of *Landaff*, *&c.* but in the *Latin*, two Years after, he ſeems to be more ſenſible of the Difficulty, how he could have Advice of it, and tells us that he [y] *ſmelt it out*. *Ward* [z] the *Poet* finds it neceſſary to bring in (ἀπὸ μηχανῆς) the little *Imp* of a Goddeſs, *Fame*, who, he ſays, filched

[y] Sup. p. 17. [z] P. 156.

the Story from *Landaff*'s Maid-ſervant, and was immediately upon the Wing to carry it to *Bonner*. He might as well, with the *Father of Poets*, have made a greater Deity command a *Dream* to go down and give *Bonner* Notice of the Deſign, and ſo the Diſcovery might have paſſed for Revelation. But tho' it was only *Fame*'s Report, yet *Bonner*, as the Poet[y] ſays, *judged it to be nought of Fiction:* And he ſaw that he was to loſe no time in taking the moſt effectual Meaſures to prevent the Accompliſhment of their Deſign, and ſent very early a truſty Meſſenger to the *Nag's-Head*. *Sacroboſco* makes him to be his Chaplain; *Champney* names him *Thomas Neale*, and ſays, in his *Engliſh* Edition, *He was then, when the Matter paſſed, belonging to* Bonner; in the *Latin* he was *one of his Domeſticks at the very time when all this was done, but before that,* Hebrew *Reader or Profeſſor in the Univerſity of* Oxford. This might paſs, if *Fitz-Simon* would not expect to be heard, who makes *Neale* come on purpoſe as far as from *Oxford* to have a Sight of the Shew; and if we muſt believe both his Story and theirs, *Neale* muſt be at *London*, and at *Oxford*, fifty Miles off, at the ſame time; or at the Tavern to attend the Meeting as ſoon almoſt as *Bonner*'s *Expreſs* could ſet out for *Oxford* to bring him up to his Lord in the *Tower*.

Their Diſagreement about the Actual Conſecrator, and the Ceremony of Conſecration.

7. If we paſs from the Intended Conſecrators to the Actual, we ſhall ſoon find as little Harmony among the Hiſtorians. *Kelliſon* at firſt ſays, and vouches *Sanders* for it, as the *Legacy to Proteſtants* ſays likewiſe upon the Authority of *Bonner*'s Letter, that *they made one another Biſhops*, and *ordained one another*. But the reſt, and *Kelliſon* himſelf afterwards, are more particular; all of them pitch upon *Scory*, except *Conſtable*, who doubts whether *Barlow* might join with him or no.

[y] Ward, ibid.

He

He ſays *they had not thought of* Scory *before* Landaff refuſed to ordain them; but *Kelliſon* ſays they had not deſired *Scory*'s Aſſiſtance, but upon the *Iriſh* Arch-Biſhop's Refuſal; and we ſhall be at a loſs to conceive how they ſhould apply themſelves to *Scory* preſently after each of theſe two Biſhops refuſed, and yet not apply to him till after they came away from the laſt of them. But the thing wherein they are at the greateſt Variance is, when they come to give an Account of the Ceremonial. *Sacroboſco*, having been pretty long upon the Tale of *Landaff*, is willing to be very brief when he comes to *Scory*'s acting his Part. *To ſay no more* (his Words are) Scory *impoſes Hands upon the reſt, and ſome of them impoſe Hands upon* Scory. Here, by laying on of Hands, he either means only Ordination in general, or elſe relates this as the *Matter* of the Ordination, and is ſilent as to the *Form*. *Kelliſon*, at the ſame time, ſays they were [z] *made with leſs Solemnity than our Aldermen and Conſtables and Cryers of the Market*; but five Years after, when he had the firſt Report of the *Nag's-Head* Ordination, he ſays he heard they were made [a] *with no other Ceremony than the laying an* Engliſh *Bible upon their Heads*. The Author of the *Preface* to *Parſons* does not think it deſerves to be treated of ſeriouſly, but repreſents it as a Droll and Farce: He uſhers it in with a Jeſt of Sir *Thomas Moore* upon the *Lollards*, who once upon a time, when they eat Fleſh upon a *Good-Friday*, put a Trick upon their Conſciences, by caſting a Pig into the Water, and ſaying, *Down Pig, up Pike*; ſo our grave Prelates, he means, at *Scory*'s uſing the Word of Command, fell down Prieſts, and roſe up Biſhops: And he concludes it with an impudent [b] Suggeſtion, That poſſibly Queen *Elizabeth* herſelf might ſupply the Defect

[z] Survey, Ann. 1603. p. 373. [a] Reply to Sutclyffe, f. 31. [b] Preface to Parſons's Diſcuſſion, n. 137.

in

in their Ordination by the Impoſition of her Hands, (as he ſays *Scherrer* tells of a certain *German* Proteſtant Lady, that *by laying on of her Hands made her Childrens* Preceptor *a Preacher*) and he dares be *poſitive* that Whitgift *would not be Arch-Biſhop of Canterbury*, till the Queen had made him Arch-Biſhop in that manner, *by his kneeling down, and her laying her Hands upon his Head.* Here the *Father of Lies* himſelf owed his forward *Diſciple* a Shame, in letting him expoſe himſelf by ſuch a palpable and notorious Falſehood; Biſhop *Whitgift* having had Epiſcopal Conſecration no leſs than ſix Years before his Tranſlation to the Arch-Biſhoprick, at the time when he was promoted to the See of *Worceſter*; and all the Ground this *Romancer* had for this Fiction, being only the Ceremony of *Whitgift*'s doing Homage for the Arch-Biſhoprick, as he had done for the Biſhoprick before, by kneeling down before the Queen, and putting his Hands between her Hands; which he has the Confidence to make the ſame with the *Queen's laying her Hands upon his Head.*

Fitz-Simon follows his Leader the *Prefacer* to *Parſons*, in making the whole Action a Comedy, and the Ceremony of Conſecration the Ἐπίτασις of it; and improves what the other had ſaid, of *Scory*'s bidding *Jewell* and the reſt riſe up Biſhops, into the diſtinct Matter and Form of an Ordination. The Matter, *Scory*'s taking each of them by the Hand, (for which he fathers a Lye upon *Junius*, that this was the primitive Impoſition of Hands;) the Form, *Up! Riſe Lord Arch-Biſhop of* Canterbury; *Up! Riſe Lord Biſhop of* London, *&c. Kelliſon*, when he comes to tell the Story, has forgot the *laying the* Engliſh *Bible upon their Heads*, and is wholly ſilent in that and all that relates to the Ceremonial. *Champney* at laſt takes upon him to give an Account of it ſome-

thing

thing more like a Scholar and a Divine, and makes *Scory* perform the Office with a little Solemnity, ſuch as the Haſte they were in would admit of. The Doctor of the *Sorbonne* did not think it decent for him to make a Play of it; to divert his Reader with *Parſons*'s *Prefacer*'s *Down Prieſt, up Biſhop*; or with *Fitz-Simon*'s *Up! Riſe Biſhop*, with the *Calviniſtical* giving the Right-Hand of Fellowſhip: but rather makes the Conſecrator have ſome Regard to the Ceremony in the *Roman* Pontifical, and the Canon of the Council of *Carthage:* Accordingly he makes the Matter to be, Scory's *laying the Bible upon each of their Heads and Shoulders*; and the Form ſuitably to the Matter, giving them *Authority to preach the Word of God ſincerely*. So it is plain he ſets aſide the Ceremonial of *Parſons*'s *Prefacer* and *Fitz-Simon*, but for what Reaſon, after he has followed *Sacroboſco* all along before, he leaves him in that where he ſeems to ſpeak of the Matter of the Ordination, *Impoſition of Hands*, I can give no Account but that it was his Pleaſure.

Their Diſagreement in this Particular, is (as I had Occaſion to ſhew before [c]) in a Matter of the greateſt Importance, the very Subſtance of the Ordination, and makes as many different Conſecrations, as there are different Accounts of the Ceremony. Nor will *Le Quien*'s Expedient ſalve the Difficulty, by patching two of them together, and attempting to make the Reader believe, that the additional Fragment out of *Fitz-Simon*, in whom alone it is to be read, ſtands in *Champney* in the Place which the *Father* gives it, and together with what goes before makes up one continued Relation of *Champney*'s own. The Authors themſelves appear to proteſt againſt ſuch a Project as this of accommodating the Difference between

[c] Supr. p. 21, 22.

them;

them; *Champney* ſays, *Scory* diſpatch'd *the Buſineſs*, uſing his Matter, and Form; that he did it *quickly*, (*citò peregit*) and that, as ſoon as it was over, *they all roſe up Biſhops*. *Fitz-Simon* likewiſe makes *Scory*'s uſing his Matter and Form the Ἐπίτασις, or chief Act in the Play, and repreſents it as done (*tumultuario opere*) in great Haſte and Confuſion, and as done immediately after they had pitched upon *Scory* for the Conſecrator. Each of them therefore appears to make his own Ceremony the whole Subſtance of the Conſecration; and we can have no Authority from either of them to tack them together, and to make *Champney*'s Ceremony in the firſt place ſtand for the Subſtance or *Body*, and the *Appendix* from *Fitz-Simon* to follow it as the *Tail* of the Ordination; but the whole of this Interpolation is the Fruit of *Le Quien*'s Sagacity and Invention.

The Authors divide again once more, about that which *Fitz-Simon* makes to be the Καταστροφὴ, or laſt Act of the Comedy, *Scory*'s being made Biſhop of *Hereford* by ſome of them, after he had made them all Biſhops of their reſpective Sees. This is peculiar to him and *Sacroboſco*, and not in the Narratives of any of the reſt; only *Champney* [d], in another place, is willing to make ſome Advantage of it, at the Hazard of *Sacroboſco*'s Reputation if it ſhould be falſe. But *Fitz-Simon* does in a manner reproach all the reſt for diſſembling the Matter, and ſays, it is *of the greateſt Importance not to conceal this part of the Play*; and he is in the right, becauſe nothing could be more comical and ridiculous than this Part. However, leſt his Readers ſhould not be forward to believe it, upon no better Authority than his and *Sacroboſco*'s Relation, he aſſures them it was *ſo in Fact*, and declared to be ſo by *Tho. Neale*, to *Haberley*

[d] Sup. p. 84.

(*a Re-*

(*a Reverend Old Man then alive*, at the time when he writ) *and to many others.*

8. And now the Reader may determine whether we have, in theſe Writers, one uniform and conſiſtent Piece of Hiſtory, or not rather a Medley or Rhapſody of wild Inconſiſtencies and Contradictions. Whether it be not, as Biſhop *Bramhall* repreſents it, [c] *A Story of a Man and no Man, that hit a Bird and no Bird, on a Tree and no Tree, with a Stone and no Stone.* An Account of a [f] Meeting of our Prelates with *Landaff*, and no Meeting, but of themſelves after *Landaff* had refuſed to have any thing to do with them: Of his coming to them, or together with them, to the *Nag's-Head*, and his never coming thither, but making them wait for him a long time, and then not coming, but diſappointing them: Of *Neale*'s coming thither to him, and delivering a Meſſage to him from *Bonner*, *Landaff*'s being there and receiving it, and being frightned into a Submiſſion to *Bonner*'s pretended Authority, and forced to make uſe of a Pretence to excuſe himſelf from doing the Office, and the Candidates, who expected it to be done by him, being provoked to affront him and give him opprobrious Language; and yet the Biſhop never being at the Place at all, to be any ways active or paſſive in the Tranſaction: And beſides, [g] to have *Bonner*'s Meſſenger brought up to him in the Tavern, or to go out firſt and confer with him, and then introduce him himſelf, to be a Witneſs of his Obedience to *Bonner*'s Commands, and a Spectator of all that was tranſacted afterwards between *Scory* and the Perſons conſecrated; upon which, or ſome like Opportunity (if any other can be thought of) of *Neale*'s qualifying himſelf to be the grand

Summary of their Differences and Contradictions.

[c] Op. p. 437. [f] Sup. p. 77, 78. [g] P. 74, 75.

Informer and Evidence of all that paſſed, the whole Foundation of the Tradition and Hiſtory ſtands. Of *Bonner*'s [g] being in the *Tower*, and not in the *Tower*, but in the *Marſhalſea*; of his preventing the Biſhop of *Landaff* from being their Conſecrator, and not that Biſhop, but *Ogle-thorp* the Biſhop of *Carliſle*; of his having [h] *Neale* in his Family, and ready at hand to be diſpatch'd away to the Tavern as ſoon as his Lord heard of the Meeting, and *Neale*'s being then at *Oxford*, at too great a diſtance to be within Call upon this Occaſion. Of the Perſons conſecrated, [i] at firſt no more than one, but increaſing, as the Story improved in ſeveral hands, to no leſs than fifteen; beſides *Jewell*, *Scory*, and *Barlow* to be added to the Number. Of an [k] *Iriſh* Arch-Biſhop being firſt applied to for the Conſecrator, and not him but *Landaff*; or if both, each of them applied to the firſt, and each of them applied to the laſt; and *Scory* thought of, and applied to, preſently after the former had given them, and yet not till the latter had given them a Denial. Of *Scory*, at laſt, being the Conſecrator, [l] alone, or, it may be, not alone, but together with *Barlow*; of his conſecrating them [m] with, and without Impoſition of Hands, (whether in the Apoſtolical or *Calviniſtical* Way) with, and without laying the Bible on their Heads and Shoulders; with, and without *Parſons*'s *Prefacer*'s and *Fitz-Simon*'s Mockery; with, and without *Champney*'s more decent Ceremonial: Laſtly, [n] of a ſingle Conſecration by *Scory*, of the Biſhops elect; and not a ſingle but a double Conſecration, of them firſt ordained by *Scory*, and then of *Scory* ordained by ſome of them. Such as this muſt be the Reſult, if we attempt to make one Story of the Relation

[g] Sup. p. 86, 87. [h] Sup. p. 88. [i] Sup. p. 80, 81, 82, &c. [k] Sup. p. 85, 86, 87. [l] Sup. p. 88. [m] Sup. p. 89, 90, 91. [n] Sup. p. 92.

in theſe Authors, a Story that effectually deſtroys its own Authority, and proves it ſelf to be an abſurd Romance and Fable.

9. The World is very much impoſed upon by *Le Quien*, when he undertakes to give them the Relation of his *Catholick Writers*, and delivers it only as it ſtands in *Champney*'s Narrative. Upon what Grounds, I would aſk, or what Authority, are we to take this for the Hiſtory? Was *Champney* the only Writer? Or does his coming laſt after the others give us good Reaſon to look upon the Account in the former Writers to be cancelled, and his alone to be the ſtanding and authentick Relation? Or has he any other Stamp of Authority than they have? He tells us, his ° whole Relation, *without adding or detracting any Word pertaining to the Subſtance of the Matter*, he had from *Bluett*, and *Bluett* from *Neale*: But have not all the others the ſame Pretenſions to vouch *Neale* for the Author of their ſeveral Stories? *Sacroboſco* ſays, that what he relates was firſt told by *Neale* to the *Old Confeſſors*, and by them to him. The *Prefacer* to *Parſons*, that he had his Account from one who had the whole Story from the Mouth of *Neale*. And *Fitz-Simon*, that he had his from *Neale* by *Haberley*, then living at the time when *Fitz-Simon* writ. *Neale*'s Account, when delivered by himſelf to *Bluett* and *Haberley*, and the *Old Confeſſors*, or to Biſhop *Bonner*, or any other Perſon who they may pretend had it from him, muſt, if he were not a Lyar and Impoſtor, be one and the ſame; and with due Care might have been tranſmitted down to Poſterity, conſiſtent with itſelf and the Matter of Fact, as he related it from what himſelf had ſeen and heard upon the Place. *Bonner*, when he had it from his Chaplain,

No Certainty what was Neale's *Account of the Story.*

° Sup. p. 18.

at

at his Return from the *Tavern*, might (beſides ſending the News to Arch-Biſhop *Heath* or others of his Deprived Brethren) have drawn up a Memorial of it from *Neale*'s Mouth, to be recorded in his Regiſter, or ſome other way: Or he might have exhibited the Fact in Evidence in his Plea againſt *Horne*'s Ordination, five or ſix Years after: Or he might at the leaſt have entered a *Memorandum* in the ſame Book in his Library [p], wherein he ſets down the Day when he was called before the Council, and refuſed to take the Oath of Supremacy, and ſo was deprived: Under which, an Account of the ſcandalous Conſecration of his Succeſſor *Grindall*, with *Parker* and the reſt, would naturally follow in its proper Place. Arch-Biſhop *Heath*, (ſo lately of the Privy-Council, and Lord Chancellor,) when [q] *Bonner*'s Chaplain brought him the Letter after the Ordination, could not fail, one would think, of looking upon the Contents of it as fit to be made known to the Publick, both at that time, and for the Ages following, in a proper Method; and tho' he had then no Authority, yet the *Chief Juſtice* who dined with him, and ſaw the Letter, would have been ready to have taken the Chaplain's Information upon Oath of the whole Matter. Another of the Deprived Biſhops, a Man of Spirit and Reſentment, *Watſon* [r] of *Lincoln*, when he came to be removed from the Tower to the Caſtle at *Wisbich*, and found it to be the common Talk of his Fellow-Priſoners there, could not but ſee a Neceſſity of directing them, not to make it only the Subject of Tittle-tattle among themſelves, or with their Friends that viſited them in Priſon; but to draw up an authentick Declaration from the Mouth of the Oracle *Neale*, or from the Teſ-

[p] Strype's Annals, Part 1. p. 140. from Wood's Athenæ Oxon. p. 125. [q] Sup. p. 86. [r] Sup. p. 19.

timony

timony of ſo many others who heard it from him in that Place, and to tranſmit it well-atteſted to be kept upon Record at *Rome*, or any other ſafe Place, for the Information of the Catholicks. Before that time *Sanders* had begun, and almoſt completed, his Hiſtory of the *Engliſh Schiſm*; and his Work *De Viſibili Monarchiâ* had been publiſhed, *Ann.* 1572. where, in the ſeventh Book, he gives a ſcandalous Account of the Reformation in *England*; on both theſe Occaſions the Party could not well forget to furniſh him with the beſt Inſtructions and Memorials, particularly ſuch as would have enabled him to give the true and exact Hiſtory of the Ordination of our firſt Biſhops.

An Expedient how to come to a Certainty.

10. If by this, or any other Way, Care had been taken, the Tradition of the Fact which we have would have been uniform, and conſiſtent with itſelf, and the firſt Relator, the Eye-Witneſs himſelf, would not have ſo many different and contradictory Stories father'd upon him: But as the Caſe ſtands now, how can we extricate ourſelves from theſe Perplexities and Uncertainties? The only Way at preſent, for the modern Advocates of the Fable, F. *Le Quien*, F. *Hardouin*, *&c.* to be able to give the World ſome certain Account, would be to ſend ſome of their Miſſionaries to a certain *Iſland*, newly diſcovered (if a Relation of ſome late *Travels* may be depended upon) [s] *where the Governor has a Power of calling what Perſons he pleaſes from the Dead, and commanding them to anſwer any Queſtions they ſhall be aſked within the Compaſs of the Times they lived in.* There the Miſſionaries may, by his Favour, have leave to call up *Neale*, and *Sacroboſco* and *Champney*, and the *Prefacer* to *Parſons*, and *Fitz-Simon*, and by confronting *Neale* with them, may learn what

[s] Gulliver's Travels, Vol. 2. p. 96.

Part in each of their Stories *Neale* will own to come from himſelf, and what he will diſclaim and leave the Authors to be accountable for; if, as it ſeems moſt probable, he does not rather declare himſelf to be a Stranger to the whole Tranſaction at the *Nag's-Head*, and neither an Eye nor Ear-Witneſs of ſuch a Conſecration as is pretended to have been celebrated there; and that he never was at the Caſtle at *Wisbich*, to tell ſuch a Story to Biſhop *Watſon*, *Bluet*, and *Haberley*, and the reſt of the Priſoners there, from whom *Sacroboſco* and the others pretend to have it in his Name: But that he is abuſed by them (as *Ariſtotle* ſaid he was by his *Commentators*, when Capt. *Gulliver* had both him and them together) and had really left *Bonner*'s Family, *and betaken himſelf to* Oxford (as *Wood* [t] relates it) *as ſoon as he was bereſt of his Lord and Patron*; at which time *Wood* ſuppoſes him *to be made the Queen's Profeſſor of the* Hebrew *Lecture*; but he had had the reading of that Lecture for ſome time before [v], and continued in it to the Year 1569. *Wood*'s Concluſion of *Neale*'s Story appears to be on better Grounds, [w] *That he is noted by ſome Writers to be the original Reporter of the Conſecration of* Matthew Parker *at the* Nag's-Head *Tavern in* Cheapſide, *which ſince is manifeſtly made a meer Forgery.*

Fitz-Simon's *Narrative determined to be the authentick Hiſtory, by the Decree of Pope* Clement XI.

11. But I forget a Place more near at hand, where the Catholicks may poſſibly be ſatisfied about this Matter, without the Trouble of a Voyage to the Iſland above-mentioned. Has not *Rome* and the Infallible Chair had the Story brought before them? Yes, they had twenty Years ſince, under the late Pope *Clement* XI. in the Caſe of the now *Abbot Gordon*, formerly Arch-

[t] Athenæ Oxon. Vol. 1. p. 250. Edit. 1721. [v] Strype's Hiſt. of Reform. p. 33. [w] Athen. ibid.

Biſhop of *Glaſcow*. The Account we have from F. *Le Quien*[x], That his Caſe was for a pretty long time under the Conſideration of the *Congregation of the Holy Office*, who *examined into the Original of the* Engliſh *Proteſtant Epiſcopacy, and their Forms of Ordination*, and came at laſt to a Reſolution, that his Orders, being derived from the Church of *England*, were invalid. *Le Quien*, in his *Appendix*[y], ſets down the *Report* of the Holy Office to the Pope, with a Requeſt in *Gordon*'s Name, that his *former Orders may be declared null, and he be qualified to receive Orders according to the Catholick Form.* In their Report of *Gordon*'s Reaſons, they ſet forth, that[z] *he proves unanſwerably from Hiſtory, the Nullity of the* Engliſh *Ordinations*; and then immediately ſubjoin the Story of the *Nag's-Head* Ordination. But how do they give the Pope a Narrative of it? in an entire uniform Relation, extracted from the ſeveral Writers down from *Conſtable* and *Sacroboſco* to *Fitz-Simon* and *Champney*? No; their Account of it (tho' they do not tell the Pope from what Author) is almoſt entirely all along in *Fitz-Simon*'s Words, only they leave out the moſt ridiculous Part of it, *Scory*'s ſubmitting, after he had ordained *Parker* and the reſt of our Biſhops, to let *ſome of his Sons re-ordain their Father.*

Here the Difficulty ſeems to be reſolved by ſo great an Authority as a Sentence of the Congregation of the Holy Office, confirmed, upon *their Votes and the reading of their Memorial*, by a Decree of the then Pope. *Le Quien* ſets forth the Proceeding as a great Inſtance of the Church of *Rome*'s acting always in ſuch Caſes, not[a] *out of Prejudice or Prepoſſeſſion, but upon mature Conſideration of the Difficulties in the Caſe.* We muſt

[x] T. 2. p. 313. [y] T. 2. Pieces Juſtificat. p. lxix, &c.
[z] Ibid. p. lxxii. [a] T. 2. p. 312.

therefore ſuppoſe, that the Cardinals of the Congregation had the ſeveral Writers of the Story of the Tavern-Ordination lying before them; not *Fitz-Simon* only, but his Brother Jeſuit *Sacroboſco*, who publiſhed it ten Years before him; and the Doctor of the *Sorbonne*, who publiſhed it again two Years after him; and that they could not but obſerve that theſe two and *Fitz-Simon* plainly contradict one another; but upon a full View, and impartial Scrutiny, they came to a Reſolution that *Fitz-Simon*'s Account of the Story is the only true and authentick Relation, and the others are to be ſet aſide in ſuch Points wherein they differ from that Writer. And if this be looked upon to be good Authority, then the only true Tradition of the Hiſtory from the original Reporter *Neale*, is not that which *Sacroboſco* and *Champney* pretend to have from *Bluet* and the other Priſoners at *Wisbich*, but that only which *Fitz-Simon* had from *Haberley*; and all the reſt (of *Landaff*'s meeting our Biſhops at the Tavern, and *Bonner*'s Meſſage coming thither to him by *Neale*, *&c.*) is Romance and Fable. But I would aſk leave to put a Queſtion to *Le Quien*. Does he believe the Story in his ſecond *Tome*, which *Gordon* and the *Holy Office* give to the Pope, to be the true Account of the Conſecration? Does he believe the ſame of his own Relation from *Champney*, *chap.* 6. of his firſt *Tome?* Then he has a ſtrong Faith, to believe both Parts of a Contradiction to be true. Does he own that the Judgment of the Pope and the Holy Office determines the Truth, in all Particulars in diſpute, to lie on *Fitz-Simon*'s Side? Then he ought when he came to it in his ſecond Part, to have retracted his former Account, from an Author whoſe Relation and *Fitz-Simon*'s are ſo plainly contradictory to one another.

Another

Another Writer [b], ſince *Le Quien*, refers us to the ſame Decree of Pope *Clement* XI. as a known Evidence of our Orders being adjudged and declared to be null in a formed judicial Proceeding of that Pope and the Congregation of the Holy Office. [c] *Tout le monde ſçait, &c.* are his Words, *All the World knows that Mr.* Gordon *was re-ordained at* Rome, *under* Clement XI. *the 17th of* Apr. 1704. *after they had declared the Ordinations made by the New Ritual of King* Edward VI. *to be null.* F. *De St. Renè*, tho' he takes a great deal of Pains to prove, almoſt from every Part of the Office, that the Ordination by King *Edward*'s Ordinal is invalid, yet is ſatisfied in his own Judgment, that our firſt Biſhops were ordained in fact by the Form in that Ordinal: And this led him into a Miſtake, as if the Decree of the Pope and Cardinals of the Office, in *Gordon*'s Caſe, were grounded upon their *declaring the Nullity of the Ordinations by King* Edward's *New Ritual.* But ſuch a Declaration muſt have related only to the following Ordinations, after thoſe of our firſt Biſhops in Queen *Elizabeth*'s Reign; of which firſt Ordinations only, the *Report* can be underſtood, where it ſays that [d] *Scory*, with regard to *Junius*'s Account of the primitive Practice, *bid* our Biſhops *kneel down*, and then ordained them, *by taking* Parker, *a certain Laic, by the Hand, and ſaying, Up! Riſe Lord Biſhop of* Canterbury; *and uſing the ſame Ceremony to ſome of the reſt that were there*; as is plain from the Words of the *Report*, as they are taken almoſt wholly from *Fitz-Simon.* If therefore the Judgment of the late Pope, formally delivered as a Decree of the Holy See, be thought by this Father to lay an

[b] De St. Renè. [c] Juſtification de l'Egliſe Rom. ſur la re-ordination des Anglois Epiſcopaux, Tom. 1. p. 169.
[d] Le Quien, T. 2 Append. p. lxxiii.

Obligation upon his Conſcience; he muſt believe that our firſt Biſhops were ordained, not at *Lambeth*, or by King *Edward*'s Ordinal, but at the Tavern, by the Form which *Fitz-Simon* puts into *Scory*'s Mouth: And he muſt retract his Opinion that their Ordinations were condemned on account of the Invalidity of the Form in King *Edward* the Sixth's *New Ritual*, which, if we give Credit to the Hiſtory out of *Fitz-Simon*, was never uſed at their Ordination.

But to leave this Father to make what Uſe he pleaſes of the Pope's Decree, how ſhall we be able to account for the Pope's declaring or ſuppoſing *Fitz-Simon*'s Story to be the true and authentick Account? Is there not Ground for an Appeal from the Pope miſinformed by that Jeſuit, to the Pope better informed by *Champney* and *Sacroboſco*? Was not their Account taken into Conſideration by the Cardinals of the Holy Office, and by the Pope? To be ſure it was, by the Care that *Le Quien* tells us is always taken not to determine in any Caſe without enquiring into the Difficulties. The Difficulty here was, whether of the two contradictory Accounts came from *Neale*. If the Pope, by his Power over the departed Souls, in a certain Place in the other World, might have a Correſpondence with *Neale*, we may look upon the Difficulty as reſolved, by his taking an Opportunity to conſult the Grand Informer; or elſe let the Catholicks tell us, whether there be any other Ground to go upon, but that the Holy Chair is under an Infallible Direction extending itſelf even to Matters of Fact; and this puts an End to the Diſpute, and clears the Hiſtory from the Uncertainty which it would otherwiſe lie under, by the Diſagreement of the ſeveral Writers, as well as it juſtifies the Decree in *Gordon*'s Caſe, and the Reordination of a Biſhop deriving his Orders from the Church of *England*, in conſequence of it.

CHAP.

CHAP. IV.

The Remarker's *Confidence in aſſerting that all the other Writers relate the ſame Account with* Champney. *His Neglect of the Profeſſion he had made of comparing his* Remarks *with the* Authors. *His diſſembling the Diſagreement between their Writers, by not producing their Accounts. His making the Differences between them immaterial and inſignificant. The* Nag's-Head *Story not to be credited, becauſe we cannot be certain which Relation to believe. The Certainty of the Tradition of it diſproved upon the ſame Ground. The Tradition in the Author of the* Legacy left to Proteſtants. *The Tradition in* H. W.'s Meditations upon the Marks of the True Church. *The Abſurdities in the ſeveral Particulars in the* Meditations. *The Old Tradition in* Sacroboſco *loſt in theſe two Writers, and revived by the Author of the Treatiſe of* Catholick Faith and Hereſy.

1. THE foregoing Chapter has, I hope, laid before the Reader a very clear and full Diſcovery, that the *Nag's-Head-Writers* ruin the Credit of their own Hiſtory, by their manifeſt Diſagreement among themſelves. By this he will be prepared to obſerve (I do not ſay the Candour and Sincerity, but) the very ſurprizing Confidence of the Author of the *Remarks on F.* Le Courayer, whom he has the Face to call to an Account for [a] *paſſing over in deep Silence, by an unwarrantable*

The Remarker's *Confidence in affirming that all the other Writers relate the ſame Account with* Champney.

[a] P. 175.

Dumbneſs, the other Witneſſes of the Nag's-Head Affair, who, he means, confirm the Relation of it by *Champney*. [b] *Thus*, he ſays, *he takes no Notice, That the ſame Account is related by* Sacroboſco *or* Holywood, *in his Book* De inveſtigandâ Chriſti Eccleſiâ, *printed in* 1603.— *and in the Preface to the* Diſcuſſion, Ann. 1612.— *and by* Fitz-Simon, *in his* Britannomachia; *and* Kelliſon, *in his* Examen Novæ Reformationis, *printed in* 1616, *after having urged the ſame Account in* 1608, *againſt* Sutclyffe—— He aſks preſently, *Why did not the* Librarian *ſhew more Candor in mentioning theſe Authors?* And ſays a little lower, that *his Cauſe is more prejudiced by diſſembling ſuch ſtrong Authorities.* This is *very pleaſant!* to allude to his own Expreſſions, when he preſumes he has it in his Power to expoſe and run down [c] Arch-Biſhop *Bramhall*. It gives me ſome Satisfaction to find myſelf not liable in this Particular to the *Remarker*'s Cenſure, as I have not been wanting to produce all their Witneſſes, and to ſet down their Depoſitions at length, and to put the Reader in a Way to compare their Teſtimonies together, and to judge of the Evidence of the Fact, as it appears from their Agreement. But whoſe Cauſe does he think F. *Le Courayer* intended to ſerve, by this Want of *Candor*, and *unwarrantable Dumbneſs in not mentioning theſe Authors?* Ours, no queſtion, he muſt ſay; becauſe if he had produced them, they would have confirmed *Champney*'s Narrative. How does that appear? Becauſe, *the ſame Account is related by them.* Here I muſt deſire the *Remarker* to tell me, Has he read the other Authors, and compared them with *Champney?* If he has not, he is pretty confident, to declare at a venture what he does not know to be true. If he has, it is a greater Piece of Confidence, and of ſomething

[b] Ibid. [c] P. 93, 94.

worſe,

worſe, to declare that which, if his Eyes were open, he muſt know to be falſe. Let him or any one read and compare thoſe Writers together, and I may be poſitive, that inſtead of ſaying *they all relate the ſame Account*, they will find themſelves obliged to ſubſcribe to Arch-Biſhop *Bramhall*'s Cenſure of the Hiſtory, as it ſtands in them, and give it the Name of [d] *A ſilly ſenſeleſs Fable, wholly compoſed of abſurd, improbable, incoherent, inconſiſtent, contradictory Fictions.* For the *Inconſiſtencies* and *Contradictions*, I need no more than to refer him or any body elſe to what has been ſufficiently made out in the foregoing Chapter: And if they think me guilty of any Miſrepreſentation, I would deſire only that they may make Uſe of all the Art and Cunning they are Maſters of, and try if they can from theſe Writers (without *paſſing over in Silence* any Part of their Teſtimonies) give us one coherent, agreeable, and ſelf-conſiſtent Relation of the *Nag's-Head* Conſecration.

His Neglect of the Profeſſion he makes of comparing his Remarks *with the Authors, &c.*

2. His Conduct is the more inexcuſable, becauſe firſt it diſcovers with what Sincerity he makes Profeſſion, at the very Entrance upon his Work [e], of his *Fidelity in his Citations*, and the *Pains he has taken to compare his* Remarks *with the Authors themſelves*, and his *never having wilfully miſrepreſented any of his Authors.* Here is one Inſtance, how far his Practice agrees with his Profeſſion. He cites the Author of the *Preface* to *Parſons*, and *Fitz-Simon*, as relating the ſame Account with *Champney*. Had he, before he ſays this, compared theſe Writers and *Champney* together? If he had not, there was little Reaſon for him to tell us he had taken ſuch Pains as he is willing to make us believe. If he had compared

[d] P. Op. 436. [e] P. 5.

them,

them, then let him juſtify himſelf, if he can, that he has not *wilfully miſrepreſented his Authors.* I wiſh I may have no other Occaſion to remind him of this Profeſſion.

His diſſembling the Diſagreement between their Writers, by not producing their Accounts.

3. Secondly, the Charge he draws up againſt F. *Le Courayer*, of *diſſembling ſuch ſtrong Authorities*, inſtead of falling upon that Writer, turns upon himſelf. For in what manner does he himſelf produce theſe Authorities? He names the Authors and their Books, and ſays, *The ſame Account is related* in them as in *Champney:* And if this be enough to ſatisfy any impartial Reader, he has done his Buſineſs; but if any one deſires to have fuller Evidence, and ſtronger Conviction, *farther this* Remarker *ſays not*; nor does he ſee any Occaſion to ſet down the whole Narratives in theſe Authors, or to make up an entire Relation out of them all, but thinks it enough to have ſet down *Champney*'s Narration, and *Conſtable*'s, and to give us his Word that the other Authors *relate the ſame Account.* Is it therefore one and the ſame Account, That *Landaff* was at the Meeting with our Biſhops, and That he was not at the Meeting? That there was a Meeting wherein he refuſed to do the Office, and That there was no Meeting appointed till after that Biſhop had refuſed to do the Office? Which one Contradiction carries a great many more Contradictions in the Belly of it, as any one that pleaſes may ſee very plainly [f] above. If this be the ſame Account, then the *Prefacer* to *Parſons*, and *Fitz-Simon*, and *Kelliſon* too (I may add) relate the ſame Account with *Conſtable*, *Sacroboſco*, and *Champney:* Not to repeat how far their Accounts are contradictory to one another in the other Particulars of the Story. I appeal therefore to the *Remarker* him-

[f] Sup. p. 77, 78, 93.

ſelf,

ſelf, if he pretends to have looked into and compared the ſeveral Authors, Whether he may not be charged very juſtly with *diſſembling his ſtrong Authorities*; for fear, if he had laid all the Authors open, and ſet them one over-againſt the other before the Reader, inſtead of putting a Trick upon him by telling him they are all of a piece, it would appear, that *Conſtable*, *Sacroboſco*, and *Champney*, on one Side, and *Parſons*'s *Prefacer*, *Fitz-Simon*, and *Kelliſon*, on the other, beſides the Differences of each Party among themſelves, ſtand in direct Oppoſition to one another, inſtead of being, as he is willing to perſuade us, at perfect Agreement.

But perhaps he will ſay, that all his Witneſſes agree in the main of the Story, That there was ſuch a Place as the *Nag's-Head* Tavern in *Cheapſide*; and That Queen *Elizabeth*'s firſt Biſhops were conſecrated there. True, they are all Witneſſes of this; but if we proceed to examine into the particular Circumſtances of their Teſtimony, they appear to be ſuch Evidences as came before the [g] Chief Prieſts and Council againſt our Bleſſed Saviour; who tho' they were *many*, yet the Council *could find none*, becauſe their *Witneſs agreed not together:* Or as the *Two Elders* againſt *Suſanna* [h], who agreed very well in the main Charge againſt her, That they took her in the very Act of Adultery, being themſelves upon the very Place, her own Garden; but upon the firſt Enquiry into Particulars, they did ſo palpably contradict [i] one another, that the innocent Lady was immediately acquitted, and they condemned of falſe Accuſation. The Caſe is the ſame: We take the Account of this ſcandalous Ordination from theſe Writers, who agree in teſtifying that

[g] Mark xiv. 55, 56. [h] Hiſtory of Suſanna, ver. 37.
[i] Ver. 54, 58.

it

it was in a Tavern: But when we come to learn from them what Perſons were at the Tavern, and how the Matter was tranſacted there from Beginning to End, here their Teſtimonies are ſo repugnant to one another, that the whole of their Evidence falls to the Ground; and the main Fact cannot be believed, becauſe the Witneſſes, on the one Side, or on the other, are proved to be Lyars; and as we cannot inform ourſelves, on whether Side the Truth or the Falſhood lies, we cannot believe any Part of the Story upon the Credit of any of them.

His making the Differences between them immaterial and inſignificant.

4. The *Remarker* owns, that [k] *this is almoſt the only Argument that ſeems to affect directly the Truth and Conſiſtency of the* Nag's-Head *Relation.* He may, if he pleaſes, ſee farther, by what has been ſaid in the Chapter before, that this one Argument by itſelf does ſo plainly and directly lay open the *Inconſiſtencies* and Contradictions of that Relation, that it takes away all Grounds of believing that there is any *Truth* in it. But we are to ſee how he endeavours to take away the Force of this Argument. He attempts to make us believe, that he finds there is no ſuch conſiderable Diſagreement between their Writers, but that the Differences are inſignificant and immaterial. And here he has an happy Opportunity of pleaſing himſelf with the Honour of a Victory and Triumph over Biſhop *Bramhall*, who, he ſays, [l] *in this very firſt Argument that he urges, does, in the ſame Breath, anſwer and refute it.* The Biſhop [m], before he proceeds to ſhew their Diſagreement, ſpeaks ſomething in Regard to the Objection of his Adverſary elſewhere, of Mr. *Maſon*'s being contradicted by other Writers on our Side at that time; for inſtance, *Butler*'s making *Hodgskin* Suffragan Biſhop

[k] P. 205. [l] Ibid. [m] P. Op. 436.

of

of *Dover*, inſtead of *Bedford*; and *Sutclyffe*'s making *two Suffragans* join with three other Biſhops in *Parker*'s Conſecration. He anſwers the Objection fully in its proper Place [n]; but here, before, in Anſwer to it, he ſays, that, "to ſet "down the Name of a Place amiſs—— or to ſay "two Suffragans for one—— are immaterial Dif-"ferences, remote from the Heart of the Cauſe, "about indifferent Circumſtances, which may "bring the Exactneſs of the Relation into queſti-"on, but not the ſubſtantial Truth of it." Upon this Ground the *Remarker* turns upon him. *Thus* [o] *he obligingly ſhews, That the* Nag's-Head *Relation may be true, tho' ſome only name* Scory *as the Performer, while others doubt whether* Barlow *did not aſſiſt, nor are poſitive how many of the new Biſhops were conſecrated at that time.* It would have been ſomething to the Purpoſe, if he had ſaid, *Thus he ſhews*, that *Sacroboſco*'s Relation may be true, though he is miſtaken in the *Name* of *Kitchin*'s Biſhoprick, whom he calls ſo many times *Laudaſenſis*, inſtead of *Landavenſis*; and his Stories of the Biſhop of *London*'s ſending ſuch a Meſſage to *Landaff*, and of the Conference between a certain Arch-Biſhop and Dr. *Alabaſter*, may be true, tho' he miſtakes the Names of the Perſons, and calls the one *Bomer* inſtead of *Bonner*, and the other *Bancraſt* inſtead of *Bancroft*. And he might ſay, it may be true likewiſe, that our Biſhops were conſecrated at the *Nag's-Head*, though their Writers diſagree in their ſeveral Denominations of the Place, *Fitz-Simon* making it to be a *Tavern*, *Sacroboſco* and *Champney* an *Inn (Hoſpitium)* the reſt only telling us the Sign (which may be of any *Publick Houſe)* the *Nag's-Head*, or *Horſe-Head*, in *Cheapſide*. Theſe indeed are ſuch immaterial Differences as thoſe that *Bramhall* ſpeaks of; and

[n] P. 472, 473. [o] P. 205.

for us to argue from theſe Differences, not only *againſt the Exactneſs, but the ſubſtantial Truth of the Relations*, would be to lay ourſelves very deſervedly under the *Remarker*'s Cenſure.

But his Concern is only, to make a Shew of proving that all other Differences between their Writers are to be looked upon as of no greater Conſequence than *Bramhall* makes ours to be. As firſt their Diſagreement about the Conſecrator, which he is willing ſhould be thus underſtood, that *ſome only name* Scory *for the Performer, while others doubt whether* Barlow *did not aſſiſt*. But in this he does not exactly repreſent either the Authors themſelves, or *Bramhall*'s Account from them. The Difference is between *Conſtable*, the firſt Writer of all, in his MS. Letter, and all the reſt that came after him in their printed Relations. *Conſtable* makes it uncertain whether the Ceremony of *Parker*'s Ordination was performed by *Scory* alone, or by him jointly with *Barlow*. The reſt leave out *Barlow*, and are poſitive for *Scory* alone. The *Remarker* thinks he has here Matter of Triumph. *Bramhall*, he had ſaid, *calls theſe Variations by the Name of Contradictions*--[p] *And where is the Contradiction in one Man's ſaying* Scory *did it, and another's ſaying he does not know whether* Barlow *aſſiſted?* He ſhould here have *compared his Remark* with *Bramhall*'s Words, who ſays indeed *the Fable is wholly compoſed of abſurd---inconſiſtent, contradictory Fictions*; but ſays preſently, *the greateſt Shew of any Accord among them is about the Conſecrator, yet even in this they diſagree*. Can he be underſtood to make this *Diſagreement*, in which there is *the greateſt Shew of Accord* that there is in any Points of Difference between them, a *Contradiction?* And yet it is but one Remove from a Contradiction, *Scory*'s being

[p] P. 206.

the

the Conſecrator *alone*, or, *it may be*, *not alone*: And if we regard the Certainty of the Story, it may be no wrong to ſay the Hiſtorians *contradict* one another; *Conſtable*, who did not uſe to ſpeak upon *light Conjectures*, making it uncertain whether *Scory* acted alone, and the others after him relating it as Fact, and conſequently certain, that he did act alone; and this muſt bid fair for a Contradiction. The other Difference, as he repreſents it, is that *they are not poſitive how many of the new Biſhops were conſecrated at that time*; *they*, that is, only one of them, *Parſons*'s *Prefacer*, who tells us himſelf that he fears *he may miſtake in the Names*. But are not all the reſt, except that Writer, *poſitive* in thoſe that they name? And how then ſhall we prevent them from contradicting one another in the Names and Number? *Champney* ſets down the Names of *Parker*, in the firſt Place, and fourteen others, conſecrated at the Tavern. *Wadſworth*, the Year before him, had ſaid there was no more than an Attempt there to conſecrate *Parker*; but denies in effect, that he or any of *Champney*'s fifteen were conſecrated there. Here is a glaring Contradiction, that ſtares him, and the other Writers, in the Face; of whom *Fitz-Simon* names four Perſons conſecrated, and *Parker* at the Head of them; and *Parſons*'s *Prefacer* five, without *Parker*; and they, as well as *Champney*, contradict not only *Wadſworth*, who makes not ſo much as one ordained at that Place, but *Conſtable* alſo, who names one, but none but *Parker*. And this Inconſiſtency and Contradiction, if we believe the *Remarker*, muſt come to no more than what he ſays, *they are not poſitive how many were conſecrated at that time*.

But ſhould not Biſhop *Bramhall*'s calling it ſo openly and roundly, *a Fable wholly compoſed of abſurd— contradictory Fictions*, have made the Author

thor of the *Remarks* think there might be ſome Occaſion for him to enquire whether the Biſhop, in this Place, had ſet down every particular Inſtance of Inconſiſtency and Contradiction? Or whether there might be any more to be found by looking into the Authors themſelves, which *Bramhall* might omit, being drawn off, as it appears, by reflecting upon the other Abſurdities, of there being [q] *no time of the Fact named, or ſuch a time as was impoſſible*; of there being *no Publick Notary at the Conſecration, or no Man knowing who that Publick Notary was?* If he had thought it worth his while to look into the Authors, would he not have found a direct Oppoſition in their Relations of the Ceremonial itſelf? that there are two contrary Conſecrations recorded there, diſagreeing in the very Subſtance, the Matter and Form? Could he have called this Diſagreement by the ſoft Name of an immaterial Difference, and inſignificant Variation? Or, which is ſtill worſe, would he not have found, that after *Conſtable*'s ſhort Sketch of *Landaff*'s Story, and *Sacroboſco*'s full Draught of it at the whole Length, relating that Biſhop's coming to the *Nag's-Head*, and all that paſſed there between him and *Neale*, and between him and our Biſhops; the Whole, and every Particular of it, ſhould be cut off all at once, by the two next Writers, who declare that *Landaff* never came to the *Nag's-Head?* and that the whole Fabrick muſt have lain utterly demoliſhed, had not the Doctor of the *Sorbonne* come in at laſt to *Sacroboſco*'s Aſſiſtance, and ſet it up again upon the old Baſis of bringing *Landaff* in once more to act his Part upon the Stage? Could he have ſaid that this Diſagreement was no more than their correcting *Sacroboſco*'s Miſtakes, of the Biſhoprick of *Laudaſſe* for *Landaff*,

[q] Op. p. 437.

daff, and *Bomer* for *Bonner?* But the *Remarker* appears to be ſo well read in their own Writers, that he owns himſelf to be a perfect Stranger to any ſuch Diſagreement. [r] *No poſitive Witneſs*, he ſays, *is even pretended to ſay, that* Parker, Scory, Landaff *or* Neale *were not at the* Nag's-Head *together, or to deny the other Particulars.* Here we ſee again the Sincerity of his Profeſſion, of his *taking the Pains to collect from, or to compare with, the Authors themſelves*, what he ſays in his *Remarks.* Can there be any two more poſitive Witneſſes alledged, to ſay that which he tells us, *None is even pretended to ſay*, than the *Preface*r to *Parſons* and *Fitz-Simon?* The former ſays *Landaff* was expected at the Tavern, and waited for by our Biſhops for a long time, but diſappointed them at laſt, and never came at all to the Meeting: The latter ſpeaks as if he were not ſo much as expected, but plainly ſays there was no Meeting at that Tavern, but only of our Biſhops and *Scory*; and before that Meeting *Landaff* had refuſed to execute the Queen's Commiſſion, and the *Iriſh* Arch-Biſhop had been applied to, and refuſed to lay Hands upon them. Both theſe Writers are poſitive Witneſſes that *Landaff* was not at the *Nag's-Head*; and are they not then poſitive Witneſſes, that *he and* Neale, *and* Parker, *and* Scory, *were not at the* Nag's-Head *together?* Will he ſay that he means Witneſſes that were preſent at the time of the Fact? Do not they vouch one that it is pretended was preſent, the grand Eye-witneſs *Neale* himſelf, from whom at ſecond-hand both theſe Writers declare they had their Information? See now the Fruits of the *Remarker*'s Care and Pains in comparing his *Remarks* with the *Authors!* See the Effect of his Confidence, which recommends him to the Catholicks as one of thoſe *Teachers*

[r] P. 189.

which St. *Paul* ſpeaks of, that [s] *underſtand neither what they ſay, nor whereof they affirm.*

The Nag's-Head *Story not to be credited, becauſe we cannot know which Relation we ought to believe.*

5. There needs no other Anſwer to be given by any Perſons whom he or *Le Quien*, *&c.* would perſuade into a Belief of the Tavern-Story, than to aſk, Which is the Story they are to believe? Is it that which he and *Le Quien* ſet down from *Champney?* All that Story, from the Beginning to the End, is certainly falſe, if the Relation in the *Preface* to *Parſons*, or *Fitz-Simon*'s Relation, is to be credited. All that Part of it which is related both by *Champney* and *Sacroboſco*, of the Tranſaction at the Tavern, between *Landaff* and *Neale*, and our Biſhops, muſt be Fiction, if that be true which is told us by the other two Writers, That he never was at the Meeting at that Tavern. And all that remains in *Champney*, of *Scory*'s performing the Office in the Manner that he relates, is as falſe, if the Ceremony was performed according to the Account of it in thoſe two Writers. We cannot find any better Ground to believe *Sacroboſco* and *Champney*, than we have to believe the *Prefacer* to *Parſons* and *Fitz-Simon*. Both Sides warrant their Accounts by *Neale*'s Authority, from whoſe Mouth they pretend to have the Story by very good Hands. *Neale*, no queſtion, told but one Story, but how to come at it, by theſe diſagreeing and contradictory Reports, we cannot tell. We muſt therefore ſuſpend our Belief till we can know what the Story is, and that, for ought we ſee, cannot be known till we can confer with *Neale* himſelf in the other World. I ſee nothing that our Adverſaries can reply to this, except they will ſay, "You have the Story as we "have it, and need not trouble your Heads about "theſe *inſignificant Variations*; but take which

[s] 1 Tim. i. 7.

"Side

" Side you pleaſe, provided you do but believe " the Story."

The Pretence of a certain Tradition of it diſproved upon the ſame Ground.

6. The ſame might be the moſt eaſy and effectual Method to ſtop their Mouths, when they bear us down with the conſtant and perpetual Tradition of the Tavern-Ordination, handed down all along among the Catholicks, ever ſince the time of the Fact. None of them proclaims this with greater Confidence than the Writer of the *Nullity of the Prelatick Clergy*[r], " It's now a " Century of Years (he means at the time of his " writing) ſince the *Nag's-Head* Story happened; " it hath been conſtantly related and credited " by wiſe Men, as a certain Truth, ever ſince " the Year 1559." If we expect to find any Proof of this bold Aſſertion in that Author, all that we have is that which follows a little lower. " That there hath been theſe hundred Years a " conſtant Tradition, between ſober and wiſe " Men, of the *Nag's-Head* Story, cannot be de- " nied by our Adverſaries, unleſs they be reſolv- " ed to ſay, that we Catholicks had no ſober or " learned Men ſince they left us. I hope the Ca- " tholick Biſhops and Doctors of Queen *Mary's* " time were ſober and wiſe Men; they believed " this Story, and recounted it to *Parſons*, (his *Prefacer*, he ſhould have ſaid,) " *Fitz-Herbert*, " Dr. *Kelliſon*, *Holywood*, Dr. *Champney*, *Fitz-* " *Simon*, *&c.*—— and they gave ſo much Cre- " dit to it that they publiſhed it in Print." Here this Writer (as weak as confident) takes for granted what he is to prove. The Point in Diſpute is, Whether the *Nag's-Head Story ever happened*, (as he expreſſes it;) not Whether, if ſuch a Fact ever happened, their Biſhops and Doctors were not *wiſe* enough to know it, and forward

[r] P. 75.

enough not only to relate it to their Friends in Confidence, but to make the whole Chriſtian World ring of it. His Buſineſs therefore was to prove firſt that there was really ſuch a Story; but all his Proof is, That their Biſhops and Doctors knew and related it, therefore there was ſuch a Story; and they were wiſe and ſober Men, therefore they muſt know and believe, and relate to the Catholicks, that there was ſuch a Story. However, if his Confidence ſupplies his Want of Reaſon, and this is all we are to expect from him to make good what he aſſerts, how can it be helped? It is therefore more eaſy to put the Queſtion to any one that will undertake to anſwer for him, What is this Tradition? Is it that which the ſame Author in his firſt Work ſays [v] *he has taken out of* Holywood's, Conſtable's, *and* Champney's *Works*, which he had ſet down juſt before [w], almoſt wholly in the Words of the laſt of thoſe three Writers? Is this the conſtant, perpetual, undoubted Tradition of the Story? There are three other Writers that follow *Conſtable* and *Holywood* at a little Diſtance, and writ about the ſame time with *Champney*; the *Prefacer* to *Parſons*, *Fitz-Simon*, and *Kelliſon*, who all three give us a Relation of the Story. Is it from the ſame Tradition that is related in the three former? Or is it not from a Tradition directly oppoſite and contradictory? Which then of theſe two are we to believe to be the true and conſtant Tradition, related by their *Wiſe Biſhops and Doctors as a certain Truth, ever ſince the Year* 1559? Will they oblige us to believe that there was ſuch a conſtant Tradition, without telling us what it is? Their Doctors, he ſays, *recounted it to* Parſons's Prefacer, Kelliſon, Holywood, Champney, *and* Fitz-Simon; *and they publiſhed it in Print.* What? Did they *recount it to* Holywood *and*

[v] Treatiſe of Cath. Faith and Hereſy, p. 9. [w] Ib. p. 7, 8.

Champney,

Champney, *and alſo to the* Prefacer *to* Parſons, *and* Fitz-Simon? then the Tradition they recounted to them is inconſiſtent with and contradictory to itſelf; for ſo it is, as it is publiſhed in Print by theſe Writers. The Doctors which he means muſt be *Harding*, *Stapleton*, *Briſtow*, and *Reynolds*, *&c.* It is a great pity that they themſelves did not print and publiſh their Relations, then we might have had the Satisfaction to ſee the ſame Agreement and Conſiſtency between their ſeveral Stories. *Harding* and *Stapleton* might have given us *Sacroboſco*'s and *Champney*'s Tradition, *Briſtow* and *Reynolds* the Tradition in *Parſons*'s *Prefacer* and *Fitz-Simon*; or if they had given only that of the two firſt, what would become of the certain Truth and Authority of the Tradition in the other two?

But the ſame Writer, in his firſt Treatiſe above cited, is more poſitive, and ſpeaks home from his own Knowledge: "[x] I have ſpoken both with Ca-"tholicks and Proteſtants that remember near "fourſcore Years, and acknowledge that ſo long "they have heard the *Nag's-Head* Story related "as an undoubted Truth." This he ſays in the Words juſt before he goes on to the Tale of Biſhop *Morton*'s Speech in the Houſe of Lords; and one would be tempted equally to diſpute his Veracity in both, That theſe Perſons were ſo old, and had ſo good Memories as to remember they had heard the Story related for certain, for ſo long time; and That Biſhop *Morton* ſhould make uſe of ſuch a Story for a Proof of the Truth of our Ordination: But it is ill Manners to give him the Lye, and hard to diſprove their ſaying that which he is ſo confident as to tell us that he heard them ſay with his own Ears. It may be therefore more proper to aſk the Author of the *Remarks* (who [y] produces this as a Teſtimony of great

[x] P. 9. [y] P. 186.

Authority, and chimes in with him that [z] *it has been a conſtant Tradition among Catholicks*) what *Nag's-Head* Story he ſuppoſes it to be, that his Author ſays theſe Perſons owned they had heard related as an undoubted Truth for near fourſcore Years? Which was it of the two oppoſite *Nag's-Head* Stories that we have been ſpeaking of? It muſt be that which the Author of the Treatiſe and the *Remarker* produce from *Champney*. That Author is wiſer (tho' the *Remarker* is not) than to tell us (after he ſays he took his Account out of *Holywood*'s, *Conſtable*'s, and *Champney*'s Works) that *Parſons*'s *Prefacer*, *Fitz-Simon*, and *Kelliſon*, in their Works, *relate the ſame Account:* And yet it is hard to believe but that he muſt have read the Story in theſe Writers as well as in the three former, tho' he might not be diſpoſed to compare them ſo nicely as to diſcover that they contradict one another. That might be no more his Buſineſs or Inclination than the *Remarker*'s, to take ſuch extraordinary Pains to ſee whether the Hiſtorians agreed among themſelves; but this Neglect is more unhappy in the *Remarker*, becauſe it led him to declare poſitively, that the two Writers who contradict *Champney* are Witneſſes for him, and *relate the ſame Account*; and that no Witneſſes can be produced to ſay, what both of them affirm, *that* Parker, Scory, Landaff, *and* Neale, *were not all at the* Nag's-Head *together at that time.*

He obſerves that the fourſcore Years (for which time thoſe Perſons ſaid they had heard the Story) [a] *carries the Account into Queen* Elizabeth's *Reign.* It does ſo indeed, pretty far, (if we count back from the Year 1657, when that Treatiſe was publiſhed) as high as before 1580. more than twenty Years before the Death of that Queen, and within eighteen Years of the time of the Conſecration

[z] Ibid. [a] P. 186.

of

of our firſt Biſhops: And (which is more pertinent to obſerve) it carries the Account up to the time when *Sanders* was writing, and had near finiſhed, his *Hiſtory of the* Engliſh Schiſm. And can it be conceived that thoſe Perſons had heard the Story related at that time for an undoubted Truth, and yet that Hiſtorian ſhould at the ſame time be ignorant of it? Or if he had Knowledge of it, can it be imagined that he would neglect to give it a Place in his Hiſtory, when his Subject, and his Bigotry and Zeal for Popery, and his Malice againſt the Reformers, muſt all oblige him to proclaim the ſcandalous Proceeding to the World? The Story itſelf furniſhes us with a particular Reaſon why *Sanders*, if he had known of it, muſt not have paſſed it over in Silence. If it was the ſame conſtant Tradition from the beginning, as it was a Century of Years after (in the time of the Writer of the *Nullity*, *&c.*) and above half a Century more now, at the time of the *Remarker*'s taking his Pen in hand; the Tradition muſt have come to *Sanders*, as it comes down now to us, in two Stories contradictory to each other, That *Landaff* was at the *Nag's-Head*, and That he was not at the *Nag's-Head*; and the following Contradictions, as they are laid open above. This the Hiſtorian muſt have perceived, and if he had any Concern for Truth, muſt have made it his Buſineſs to ſet the Matter right, and to reconcile this Diſagreement in the Relation; and he muſt have had it in his Power to do it with Eaſe, by conſulting the Perſons from whom he had his Information, and even *Neale* himſelf, who might without Difficulty have been ſpoken with, or writ to about the Matter (being, as [b] *Wood* informs us, at or near *Oxford*, from the time when he left *Bonner* to the End of his Life;) and by the true Anſwer which he would have had

[b] Athenæ Oxon. Vol. 1. p. 250.

from *Neale*, he could not fail of rectifying the Miſtake in the Tradition, and tranſmitting down to Poſterity one and the ſame Account of the Fact, as it really was; except the Oracle *Neale* himſelf ſhould tell him two contradictory Stories; and then indeed this would be a better Reaſon than any they give, why *Sanders* ſhould reſolve to be wholly ſilent in the Matter, and chuſe rather to drop the whole Tradition, and relate neither of the Stories, than to expoſe himſelf to the Loſs of his own Reputation, by committing a Piece of Hiſtory to Writing, ſo plainly inconſiſtent with and contradictory to itſelf.

The Tradition in the Legacy left to Proteſtants.

7. To loſe no Evidences of the Tradition, the *Remarker* cites [c] the Author of the *Legacy left to Proteſtants*, printed *Ann.* 1654. who ſays he had his Account from two *certain Witneſſes*. The firſt Witneſs is Dr. *Darbyſhire*; the other, the Gentleman *whoſe Father, one of our Chief Juſtices, was at Dinner with Arch-Biſhop* Heath *when he received a Letter from* Bonner, *out of the* Marſhalſea, *that upon his having diſſuaded* Oglethorp *from ordaining them, they ordained one another in an Inn where they met together.* The laſt Teſtimony, of the Chief Juſtice's Son from *Bonner*'s Letter, I have had Occaſion to conſider [d] already, and ſhewed that it ſets aſide *Sacroboſco*'s and *Champney*'s Story, as it makes *Bonner*'s Priſon at that time to be the *Marſhalſea*, and not the *Tower*, (from whence *Sacroboſco* ſays he ſent his Chaplain to the Inn) and turns *Kitchin* of *Landaff* out of his Office of Intended Conſecrator, as it makes not him but *Oglethorp* of *Carliſle*, the Perſon whom *Bonner* writes he had prevailed upon not to ordain the Proteſtant Biſhops *in his Dioceſs*, and ſo had brought them under a Neceſſity of taking up with ſuch a Conſecration. Who now would envy the *Remarker*

[c] P. 187. [d] Sup. p. 86.

the

the Credit of accumulating ſo many ſubſtantial Witneſſes, to no other Purpoſe than for us to have the Satisfaction of ſeeing how they contradict one another? If the other Witneſs, Dr. *Darbyſhire*, had related the Particulars of the Story, we might have ſeen the like Agreement between him and the other Witneſſes before his Teſtimony was produced; but his is nothing more than this, *That like Good Fellows they had made themſelves Biſhops at an Inn, becauſe they could not get true Biſhops to conſecrate them.* How, and with what Ceremony they made themſelves Biſhops, and whether *Landaff* or *Oglethorp*, or any other Perſons, were the true Biſhops whom they attempted to get to conſecrate them, but were refuſed; in theſe Particulars, and all the reſt of the Tranſaction, we have no Light from Dr. *Darbyſhire*, tho' he, being Nephew to *Bonner*, (if not more nearly [e] related) and Canon of St. *Paul*'s, and the Biſhop's Chancellor, juſt before or at the time of the Conſecration of our firſt Biſhops, could not have failed, if they were ordained at the *Nag's-Head*, to have had the ſame Account from his Uncle's Mouth, that *Bonner* ſent to *Heath* by Letter; and the Author of the *Legacy*, *&c.* might have had as full and particular Information from him as he had from *Bonner*. Mr. *Strype* ([f] where he ſets down this Author's Account) notes in the Margin, that Dr. *Darbyſhire* died *Ann.* 1604, which being ſo near the time when the Story firſt appeared, being never publiſhed till by *Sacroboſco* the Year before, and not then come to *Kelliſon*'s Ears, who firſt tells us of his having heard a Report of it five Years after, *Ann.* 1608. we may have Reaſon to think, as Dr. *Darbyſhire* ſays no more of it, that he ſpake only what then came to be bruited abroad of the newly-invented Fable, then begin-

[e] Strype's Memorials, Vol. 3. p. 111. [f] Life of Matth. Parker, p. 59.

ning

ning to be credited and divulged among the Party. Dr. *Darbyſhire*, the *Legacy* ſays, *ſpoke what he knew*; but the Author ſhould have aſſured us, that he declared that what he ſpoke was true, of his own Knowledge. He was old enough, and near at hand, to have had the Story preſently from his Uncle, or from his Chaplain *Neale* himſelf at the firſt hand. But if *Bonner* never had it related to him by *Neale* (as will be put out of Diſpute when we come to the Caſe between that Biſhop and *Horne*) and conſequently *Neale* never had any ſuch Story to tell him, (which, if he had, muſt have been his firſt Buſineſs after his Return from the Tavern) then we may very well call it in queſtion, whether *Darbyſhire* ever heard of it from *Bonner* or *Neale*, and ſo what becomes of this Author's Aſſeveration, that he *ſpoke what he knew?*

The Tradition in H. W.'s Meditations on the Marks of the True Church.

8. After the *Legacy left to Proteſtants*, we might have expected the *Remarker* ſhould have produced farther Evidence, from another Treatiſe, printed the very next Year (1655.) at *Paris*, by *H. W.* The Title of it is, *Meditations upon the Marks of the True Church:* And the Author, in his Meditation upon the Mark of *Apoſtolical Succeſſion*, to ruin the Pretenſions of the Church of *England* to that Mark of a True Church, gives an Account of Matters relating to the Ordination of our firſt Biſhops, ſo very ſingular and ſurprizing, that it well deſerves to be ſet down entire in his own Words, to ſhew the uniform and conſtant Tradition, as it came down to him at that time. He ſays [s], "The Catholicks urge very poſitive and "probable Arguments to convince the Proteſtants "unlawful Calling; and that they had not any "Conſecration or Juriſdiction from them. For

[s] P. 121, & ſeq.

"firſt,

" firſt, the Catholick Biſhops all of them abſo-
" lutely refuſed to conſecrate any of the Prote-
" ſtants; who ſeeing this, and not hoping to
" obtain it of them in a fair Way, aimed at the
" getting of it by under-hand Dealing; but that
" Good Old and Infirm Biſhop [h] (of whom they
" thought to have taken Orders without diſcover-
" ing that they were Proteſtants) having got ſome
" Hints of their Deſign, rejected them. Their
" next Plot was the producing of a Regiſter,
" in which were ſet down the Names of divers
" Proteſtant Biſhops, ordained by ſuch and ſuch
" Catholick Prelates; but the forging and Fraud
" of this Regiſter was ſoon laid open by the Ca-
" tholick Party, and ſo that Attempt ceaſed.
" The next *Machine* they moved was by an Or-
" der from the Court, for ſome Divines and
" Lawyers to conſult about a new Form of
" making Clergymen, without Dependence on
" the Church of *Rome*; but the Ridiculouſneſs of
" this Ἀδύνατον ſoon made that Conventicle deſiſt—
" At length therefore they reſolved to ordain each
" other without more ado, which ſeven or eight
" of them ventured upon all in one Day private-
" ly, in an Inn [i], and without any Witneſſes.
" And laſtly, Queen *Elizabeth* and the Parlia-
" ment ordained, That all who had the Queen's
" Letters Patents to be Biſhops, ſhould be ac-
" knowledged for True Biſhops, notwithſtanding
" whatſoever Defect might have happened in the
" Conſecration of them."

9. The Hiſtory and Chronology of this Writer is very extraordinary, as well as his reading in the Writers before him, from whom he would ſeem to have taken his Account of the Facts that he relates. *The Abſurdities in the* Meditations *conſidered.*

[h] In the Margin, Oglethorp Biſhop of Carliſle. [i] In the Margin, Nag's-Head.

relates. Firſt he ſays their Biſhops *all of them abſolutely refuſed to conſecrate any of the Proteſtants.* Here *Harding* might have taught him, that it was poſſible that they were not every one of them *aſked*, who ſays they [k] *either were not required, or refuſed to conſecrate them:* And probably moſt of the Popiſh Biſhops were never deſired, having, before *Parker* was elected Arch-Biſhop, [l] had the Oath of Supremacy tendered to them, and ſuffered themſelves to be deprived for refuſing to take it; ſo that their Minds were ſufficiently known, that it would be to no purpoſe to aſk them to perform the Office of conſecrating him or any of his Brethren, which they could not do without tendring the Oath to them which they themſelves had ſo lately refuſed. But grant that they were all aſked, and abſolutely refuſed, what had *Parker* and the other Proteſtant Prelates then to do? The Author tells us of three Expedients they made Trial of, before they reſolved upon the *Nag's-Head* Ordination. Firſt they attempted to put a Trick upon one of the Popiſh Biſhops, *Ogleſthorp* of *Carliſle*, and to get themſelves ordained by him without diſcovering that they were Proteſtants: When this failed, they forged a Regiſter of their Conſecration by ſuch and ſuch (not Proteſtant, but) Catholick Biſhops: When that was proved to be a Forgery, then they had a Meeting of Divines and Lawyers to conſult about a Form of making Biſhops without Dependence upon the Pope: And when this was found to be impracticable, at laſt they reſolved to meet at the *Nag's-Head*-Inn, and ordain one another; but were ſo wiſe as to do it privately and without any Witneſſes: And Queen *Elizabeth* and the Parliament (which is the only thing wherein he appears

[k] Detection of Jewell's Errors, &c. f. 234. [l] Strype's Annals, Vol. 1. p. 143.

to

to follow ſome of the old Authors) ordered that they ſhould be owned for true Biſhops, notwithſtanding any Defects in their Conſecration.

For the firſt Project, of getting Orders, by a Trick, from the Biſhop of *Carliſle*, without his perceiving that they were Proteſtants; how can it be imagined to be practicable? except the *Old infirm Biſhop* had ſo far loſt his Sight, and his Hearing, and his Head too, as not to be able to give the Candidates for the Order any previous Examination; or, when he came to perform the Ceremony, to ſee the Difference between conſecrating them by the Ordinal of King *Edward*, and by the *Roman* Pontifical; and between their taking, before him, the Oath in the Ordinal to the Queen's, and that in the Pontifical to the Pope's Supremacy: Or elſe, that they thought of making the ſame Attempt upon him that the Writer of the *Nullity* [m] impudently ſays they actually made upon *Landaff*, to *inveigle him into a Tavern, and there with good Words and good Cups, to bring the Old Man to a good Humour*; that is, to diſpoſe him to give them the Order, without enquiring what their Faith or Religion was, or of what Church they profeſſed themſelves to be. The Biſhop, the *Meditation* ſays, had got ſome Hints of their Deſign, and ſo rejected them: But the Author might have read, a Year before, in the *Legacy to Proteſtants*, (where *Oglethorp* was firſt brought upon the Stage, none being ever mentioned before but the *Iriſh* Arch-Biſhop and *Landaff*) another Story, from *Bonner*'s Letter to *Heath*, whereby it appears that, if they addreſſed themſelves to *Oglethorp*, they had no Deſign of *under-hand Dealing*, but acted fairly and above-board, and came near to bring that Biſhop to a Compliance, had not *Bonner* ſtept in and diſſauded

[m] P. 78.

him;

him: So that here again we have the Satisfaction of ſeeing two contradictory Stories of the ſame Perſon, in two Authors that writ within a Year of one another: To our full Conviction (to be ſure) that there was always among the wiſe and ſober Catholicks, one and the ſame conſtant, certain, and undoubted Tradition of the *Nag's-Head* Story.

For their next Plot, of a Regiſter of Popiſh Conſecrators of our Biſhops, the Fraud and Forgery whereof, he ſays, was laid open by the Catholick Party, and ſo a Stop put to the Attempt: If this Regiſter was, as he makes it, produced by the Proteſtants, and exploded and ſilenced by the Catholicks, before the Conſecration at the *Nag's-Head* (between which and this Regiſter he makes them try another *Expedient*) how ſhall we reconcile that Fact to the Order of Time? None of their Writers ever pretended to ſay that we had forged a Regiſter before *Fitz-Herbert*, (*Ann.* 1613.) and *Fitz-Simon* and others ſoon after him; and if the time of that Conſecration was not till after we had produced this Regiſter, and the Catholick Writers had laid open the Forgery of it; the Date of the Conſecration muſt be removed half a Century lower, from 1559 to 1613. and ſome Years after (for that was the time when our Regiſter had been produced, and the ſeveral Writers took it in hand to ſhew it was forged) and our Biſhops, if they could have lived ſo long, muſt have waited all that time to invent that Regiſter, and offer it to the World; and when they found it would not do, nor the other *Machine* (as he calls it) which they *moved* after it, then they muſt have appointed the Meeting at the *Nag's-Head* to ordain one another. Such as this is *H. W.*'s Skill in the Chronology of that time, which he ſhews in his *Meditations*. However, this Project of a Regiſter is not of his own Invention; but here

he agrees better with the Author of the *Legacy*, who had diſcovered it a Year before him, and his Words are cited in the *Remarker*, [n] *I know they have tried many Ways, and feigned an old Record to prove their Ordination from Catholick Biſhops*; which *Record* he proceeds to prove to be *falſe* by what *he had heard from his two Witneſſes, Dr. Darbyſhire* and the *Son of the Chief Juſtice*. Mr. *Strype* [o], who has it from the *Legacy* as well as the *Remarker*, underſtands that *Parker*'s Regiſter is meant by this *Record*, as he might well do, becauſe no other was ever produced by any Proteſtant Writer, or pretended to be diſproved by any of theirs; but if the ſecond Writer *H. W.* may be conceived to give us the Meaning of his Fore-Man the Author of the *Legacy*, the *Old Record to prove their Ordination from Catholick Biſhops* muſt be *a Regiſter wherein were ſet down the Names of divers Proteſtants ordained Biſhops by ſuch and ſuch Catholick Prelates*; whoſe Names too we muſt preſume were ſet down in the ſame Regiſter, and cannot be the Names of *Catholick Prelates*, if they were *Barlow*, *Scory*, *Coverdale*, and *Hodgskins*; nor can this be underſtood of *Parker*'s Regiſter, but of another, firſt diſcovered in theſe two Writers, and never otherwiſe heard of either before or ſince, but in the *Remarker*; and we may leave it to him, if he ever took the Pains to underſtand what the Author of the *Legacy* means by the *Old Record* which he charges us with the Forgery of, to let us know where that *Record* and *Regiſter* is to be found.

H. W. diſcovers as great Skill in Hiſtory and Chronology, in his Account of the next Machine that they moved, a Conſultation of Divines and Lawyers about a new Form of making Clergymen without any Dependence upon the Church

[n] P. 187. [o] Life of Matth. Parker, p. 59.

of

of *Rome*. Of what Time, and what Perſons, and what Form, this Piece of Hiſtory is to be underſtood, it is hard to determine. 'Tis a *New Form*, about which they were to conſult by an Order from Court in the Queen's Time; it cannot therefore be that Form or Manner of electing, confirming, and conſecrating Arch-Biſhops and Biſhops without the Pope's Bull, which was eſtabliſhed by Act of Parliament, 25 *Hen.* VIII. nor that which was eſtabliſhed in King *Edward*'s Reign, when the new Ordinal came into the Place of the *Roman* Pontifical: And yet Queen *Elizabeth* introduced no other Form, but only revived in her firſt Parliament, that which had been enacted before by the Laws of her *Father* and *Brother:* So that it is plain there was no new Form that ſome Divines and Lawyers met at that time by Order from Court to conſult about. This Author indeed ſays, that the *Conventicle* that met about it were obliged to deſiſt upon the Ridiculouſneſs and Impracticableneſs of contriving ſuch a Form, of making Clergymen without any Dependence on the Church of *Rome*. And yet ſuch a Form, notwithſtanding the Ridiculouſneſs and Impracticableneſs of it, had been conſulted about and eſtabliſhed by Law ſo long before Queen *Elizabeth*'s time as the Year 1534, 25 *Hen.* VIII. and put in Practice conſtantly from that time to the firſt Year of that Queen; without the Biſhops being made with any Recourſe to the See of *Rome*, but during the ſhort Reign of Queen *Mary*; ſo that the Story of this Conſultation is neither agreeable to the Matter of Fact nor the Order of Time.

After all this great Accuracy in the Writer of the *Meditations*, it is not to be wondered at, that when he comes to make them *ordain one another at the Inn*, he ſhould offer to be more preciſe and exact in the Number of the Perſons conſecrated, than

than the Writers before him. *Champney* had made them fifteen; others one, or four, or five by Name, and ſome nameleſs; but he thinks *ſeven or eight* a moderate and competent Number. But what is moſt extraordinary is, that he tells us thoſe ſeven or eight, who *ventured to ordain one another*, performed the Ceremony ſo *privately*, as to do it *without any Witneſſes*. What ſhall we think now of the Old Story of the Principal Eye-witneſs Mr. *Neale*, who (as Biſhop [p] *Bramhall* expreſſes it) *was the Spy, was the Witneſs, was the Notary, was the Chief Engineer of Forgery, was the* All *in this Diſcovery*; as well as of the other *Catholick Witneſſes of entire Credit*, which *Conſtable* ſpeaks of; beſides Old *Faircloth*, and *John Stow*, of the greater Authority becauſe Proteſtants? If this Author's Account is to be regarded, there was not one Soul preſent but the ſeven or eight Biſhops themſelves, who were both the Conſecrators and the Perſons conſecrated; and, as they took care that no body elſe ſhould be there, to be a Witneſs for or againſt them, but themſelves, they muſt be the only Notaries preſent to draw up an Act of the Conſecration: And if theſe ſeven or eight were true to one another, and to their Deſign of keeping the Fact private and concealed from the reſt of the World, how ſhould either *H. W.* or any one elſe, before or after him, come to have heard a Word of the Story?

10. Such was the Tradition, as it came down to theſe two Authors, the Writer of the *Legacy left to Proteſtants*, and *H. W.* at the Diſtance of half a Century from the time when it was firſt committed to Writing by *Sacroboſco* in his Book *De inveſtigandâ Chriſti Eccleſiâ*, or, (as we may render it) his *Meditations upon the Marks of the True Church*; *The Old Tradition in* Sacroboſco *loſt in theſe Writers, and revived by the Treatiſe of* Catholick Faith and Hereſy.

[p] Op. p. 437.

and within four or five Years of the time when the Author of the *Nullity of the Prelatick Clergy of* England tells us (*Ann.* 1659.) it had been [q] *conſtantly heard, credited and related by the wiſe and ſober Catholicks for a Century compleat.* What Tradition muſt we ſuppoſe that Author to mean, *related* all along by the *Wiſe and Sober Catholicks?* Is it the Tradition in theſe two Writers juſt before him? Or is it that which he had, two Years after, in his firſt Treatiſe (*Ann.* 1657.) copied out from the old Writers *Champney* and *Sacroboſco?* Can it be ſaid that this and theirs is the ſame Tradition, when the Legacy tells a Story of *Oglethorp*, from ſo good Authority as a Letter of *Bonner*'s, quite contrary to *Sacroboſco*'s and *Champney*'s Account of *Landaff*; and the *Meditations*, inſtead of the old Hiſtory, give us ſuch a new and ſtrange Relation, as ſhews the Author, as well as his Hiſtory, to be an *Original?* By this we may judge of the Strength of the Argument in the Writer of the *Nullity*, which he ſtrenuouſly urges for (not the Certainty and Conſtancy only, but) the *Indefectibility* of this Tradition. [q] *Time* (he ſays) *may wear out Writings, and other Monuments, but Tradition will laſt as long as Men and Time, it is a never-decaying Evidence*, &c. But if it had not been for the Writings of *Champney* and *Sacroboſco*, what would have become of the Old Tradition, inſtead of which we have ſuch a Relation in the *Legacy* and *Meditations*, ſo little time before the Writer of the *Treatiſe of Catholick Faith, &c.* took it in hand? Was not the Tradition in a manner loſt, or very much *decayed*, when theſe two *Wiſe and Sober Catholicks*, the Authors of the *Legacy* and the *Meditations*, came to give an Account of it, and not recovered, but by the Author of the *Treatiſe*'s having Recourſe to that

[q] P. 75. [r] Ibid.

which he found in the Old Writers? without which Way of rectifying the Account, it might have paſſed from theſe two juſt before him, under a quite contrary Appearance to that which it had before or ſince. I might add (as has been ſhewed before) that the Tradition in *Sacroboſco* was almoſt dropt from the Memory of Man, or a contrary Tradition diſcovered, ſo early after him as by the time that the *Prefacer* to *Parſons* and *Fitz-Simon* came to publiſh their Relations; wherein they ſet his Story aſide, as *Champney* afterwards did theirs; from whoſe time, the Tradition has appeared in Print (in him and *Sacroboſco* on one Side, and *Fitz-Simon* and *Parſons*'s *Prefacer* on the other) in two Stories plainly contradictory to one another, almoſt in every Particular. Which when the Author of the *Remarks*, or *Le Quien*, or any body elſe, can reconcile, then it may paſs for *one and the ſame conſtant, certain, and undoubted Tradition.*

CHAP. V.

The Abſurdities in the Particulars of the Story. Scory's *being ordained by ſome who were juſt before ordained by him.* Parker *and the Biſhops repreſented as acting the Part of Fools or Madmen. The Pretence falſe, that they were forced by the Refuſal of the Popiſh Biſhops to ordain them.* Champney's *Introduction to his Narrative. His Inconſiſtency with himſelf in regard to the* Time. *His abſurd Repreſentation of* Landaff's *Obedience to the Queen's Mandate.* Landaff *could never have an Opportunity of coming to the Tavern to conſecrate* Parker. Champney's *Relation abſurd in the Account of* Bonner *and* Neale. *The Abſurdity of his Account of* Scory *and the Conſecration performed by him. Our Biſhops Admiſſion into their Sees, and continuing in Poſſeſſion of them, impoſſible, if they had that Conſecration. The Pretence that the Parliament* confirmed *the Ordination at the* Nag's-Head. Le Quien's *falſe and ſcandalous Account of Arch-Biſhop* Parker's *Conduct in the Parliament,* 8 Eliz.

The Abſurdities in the Particulars of the Story.

1. ENough has been ſaid to deſtroy the Credit of the Hiſtory and Tradition of the Tavern-Ordination, by comparing the Writers of the Story together, and laying open their Inconſiſtencies and Contradictions. It will be as effectually deſtroyed, if we conſider the many palpable Abſurdities which diſcover themſelves in the Particulars of the Story in their Narratives, and make

make it impoſſible to look upon it either as a true and credible, or as a ſerious Piece of Hiſtory.

2. One Inſtance might be ſufficient, from the *laſt Act of the Comedy*, as *Fitz-Simon* calls it, of Biſhop *Scory*'s humble Submiſſion, after he had given the Order to *Parker* and his Brethren, to kneel down and to receive the ſame Order from ſome one or more of them. This is told us with Aſſurance by that [a] Writer and [b] *Sacroboſco*, however oppoſite they are to one another in the other Parts of their Relations. And [c] *Champney*, tho' he does not ſet down this Particular in his Narrative, yet is willing to make uſe of it, to prove that *Scory* was no true Biſhop. But can it be imagined that theſe Writers were under any Concern to relate nothing in this Particular but what was real Matter of Fact; and not rather that their Buſineſs was to ſtick at nothing that would make the Mock-Conſecration as ridiculous and ſcandalous as they were capable of repreſenting it? For could our Prelates, if they had any Senſe of Religion, or Uſe of their Reaſon, at the time when they were to be promoted to the higheſt Function in Chriſt's Church, and to act their Parts in the Celebration of a ſacred Office, have been guilty of ſo great Folly and Profaneneſs? Could *Parker* and the others pretend to receive the Epiſcopal Order from *Scory*, and, as ſoon as they had received it, proceed immediately to declare that he had no more Power to make them Biſhops, than any of them had to make him? What Need had they of him for their Conſecrator, or how could they be the better for it, if he was of no higher Order than themſelves? Might they not with as good Reaſon have left him out, and have laid

Scory's being ordained by ſome of the ſame Perſons who were juſt before ordained by him.

[a] Sup. p. 13, 14. [b] Supr. p. 9. [c] Supr. p. 84.

Hands upon one another? *Parker*, as the firſt, laying his Hands upon the reſt, and then they all or ſome of them riſing up and laying their Hands upon him? If they choſe to have their Conſecration from *Scory*, it muſt be becauſe he had been owned, by the Proteſtants at leaſt, to be a Biſhop in King *Edward*'s time; and would they then have plainly acknowledged that, tho' he was ſo reputed formerly, yet at this time they did not look upon him to be a Biſhop, but knew that he was really no more than what they themſelves were as much as he, that is, in no higher Degree than that of Prieſthood? Or would he, who had acted as a valid and legal Biſhop in King *Edward*'s Reign, and had no Reaſon, upon Proteſtant Principles, to think otherwiſe of himſelf, than that he had truly received the Epiſcopal Order from *Cranmer* and his other Conſecrators, would he have now ſo degraded himſelf, as at the time when he was executing the Epiſcopal Function in ordaining others, to confeſs that he was no Biſhop, but of the ſame Order with them whom he was ordaining, and that any of them had as good Right and Authority to ordain him, and he himſelf ſtood in as much Need to be ordained by them? If we could ſuppoſe them to act ſo plainly againſt their own Senſe and Reaſon, if they had any; it is ſtill farther to be conſidered, that both the *Father* and the *Sons* muſt take upon them in the Action to confer the Gifts and Graces of the *Bleſſed Spirit* annexed to the Ceremony of Ordination; and is it not an Horror to conceive, that they ſhould audaciouſly and ſacrilegiouſly make no more of ſuch a ſolemn Part of Religion, and of giving and receiving the *Holy Ghoſt*, than a Jeſt and Mockery? When the Author of *Don Quixote* comes to make his *Hero*, inſtead of entering the Liſts againſt ſome rival *Knight* or *Giant*, prepare himſelf for a deſperate Encounter with

with the *Windmills*, we need nothing farther to ſatisfy us that it was not his Deſign to give us true Hiſtory, but Romance: So whatever we might think of all that occurs in the *Nag's-Head* Story, before we come to this Part of it; here we muſt be under a Conviction, that the Writers had no other Intent, but to ſay any thing that would beſt ſerve to ridicule and expoſe the Reformation, tho' it might be ſo abſurd that no Man could poſſibly give any Credit to it: To repreſent theſe firſt Biſhops of the Proteſtant Church of *England* as going into the Place of Conſecration, to come out again inveſted not with their Mitres and Rochets, but each of them with a Fool's Cap and Coat, or a *Sanbenito*; to make them prove their Ordination in a *Circle*, their having the Epiſcopal Order from none but *Scory*, and his having the ſame Order from none but them; as if he had led them to join Hands and dance in a Ring, he giving firſt to *Parker* the Right Hand of Fellowſhip, and *Parker* giving it to another, and he to a third, till the laſt in the Round gave it to *Scory*; and after this Merriment, ſaluting one another Biſhops.

Parker and the Biſhops repreſented as acting the Part of Fools or Madmen.

3. But it is not only in the laſt Act, but in the whole Plot and Deſign of the Play, that our Prelates are repreſented as acting the Part of Fools or Madmen. For could it be any thing elſe, for Men that had by a gracious Diſpenſation of Providence, after their Sufferings in the former Reign, a Way now opened for them to be promoted to the higheſt Stations in the Church, as well as to a great Degree of Honour in the State, and Revenues ſuitable to it, by the Favour of the Queen, with the Concurrence and Approbation of all the Nobility, Gentry, and People, that were not Enemies to the Reformation; for theſe Men, whom our Adverſaries make ſo greedy and ambitious of their Preferments, by their own Conduct to de-

feat the Hopes and Expectations of themſelves and their Friends, and to make it impoſſible for them to be owned or admitted for Biſhops, or to be inveſted with the ſpiritual Juriſdiction, or temporal Dignity and Revenue, belonging to their Sees? The Canons of the Church, and the Laws of the Realm, had preſcribed the Method wherein our Biſhops were to be made, and the Government were then taking the proper Meaſures to make them Biſhops in a canonical and legal Way. To conſider it firſt in *Parker*'s Caſe, who was to be made Arch-Biſhop of *Canterbury* in the room of *Poole*, lately deceaſed. Queen *Elizabeth* nominated him to the Arch-Biſhoprick; but if we look into the Account of him in Hiſtory, we find [d] with how great Difficulty, and a Reluctance almoſt invincible, he was at length brought to accept of that Promotion. He was thought of, it appears, ſoon after the Queen's Acceſſion to the Throne, and had an Intimation of it given him by a Letter from his great Friend the Lord Keeper *Bacon*, as early as the Beginning of *Decemb.* 1558. But the other Letters that paſſed from that time as far as to the End of *May* following, between him and the Lord Keeper and Secretary *Cecil*, and his own Letter afterwards to the Queen herſelf, when he was come up in Obedience to her Commands, ſhew the little Ambition he had to be made Arch-Biſhop, or rather his utter Averſeneſs to be advanced to that high Station. When he was at laſt brought to ſubmit to the Queen's Pleaſure, then [e] ſoon after, *July* 18, a *Conge d'Eſlire* was ſent down to the Dean and Chapter of *Canterbury*, by whom, on the firſt of *Auguſt* following, he was elected Arch-Biſhop. After his Election was confirmed, the Government were proceeding imme-

[d] Burnet's Hiſt. of Reform. Part 2. p. 379, 401. Collect. p. 353, & ſeq. [e] Burnet's Hiſt. ibid. p. 402. Strype's Life of Matth. Parker, p. 52.

diately to compleat his Advancement to that Dignity in the uſual Forms; and the Queen's Letters Patents, ſignifying her Aſſent to his Election, with a Command to ſix Biſhops to confirm and conſecrate him, were drawing up and paſſing the Seals in the Offices of the Secretary, Lord Privy-Seal, and Lord Keeper; and the [f] Great Seal was put to them the ninth of *September*. That this was doing, *Parker*, at whoſe Expence it was to be ſollicited and expedited in the ſeveral Offices, could not be ignorant; and can it be conceived, that he who had ſo long ſtood out, and with ſo great Earneſtneſs declined his Promotion, ſhould now, when it was ſo near the Point of being effected, on a ſudden be in ſuch great Haſte, as not to have the Patience to wait for a few Days, till the Letters Patents ſhould paſs the Broad Seal, or a little longer till the Mandate ſhould be executed; but of his own Head to take a Courſe to get himſelf conſecrated (as *Champney* makes him) before the time; not with a previous Confirmation of his Election, nor with four Biſhops to perform the Ceremony of his Conſecration, at a proper Time and Place, and by the Form appointed by Law; but ſo as to break through all Laws divine and human, and to lay aſide not only the canonical and legal Forms, but all the Solemnities of *Religion*? Could he be ſo weak or wild as to imagine that this Method would be of any Service to him, to get himſelf legally inſtalled in the Arch-Biſhoprick? Could he think that the Queen, who (tho' ſhe almoſt courted him to be Arch-Biſhop) had not the leaſt Thought of preferring him, but in the Way preſcribed by the Law, would, when ſhe ſaw herſelf ſo much abuſed by this Mock-Conſecration, have admitted him into her Preſence, and given him leave to

[f] Burnet, p. 402. Strype, p. 54.

do

do Homage to her as a true and lawful Arch-Biſhop, and to have her Writ for the Reſtitution of his Temporalties? Would ſhe have allowed him the Place belonging to his Dignity in her Court and Council, to have Precedence before the Great Officers of State and Peers of the Realm, there and in all other publick Aſſemblies? Could his Friends, the Lord Keeper and Secretary *Cecil*, adviſe and encourage the Queen to make herſelf a Party in ſo ſcandalous a Neglect and Contempt both of Religion and the Laws of Church and State; and, when nothing but his own Folly and Madneſs could occaſion his Violation of them, to connive at it, and to make uſe of her Royal Authority in his Favour, in Derogation to the Canons, and to the Statutes of her Father and Brother, ſo lately re-eſtabliſhed by herſelf in her firſt Parliament? Muſt we not rather think, that the Queen either ſent for him at firſt out of *Bedlam* to be made Arch-Biſhop, or that when, after the Part he had acted at the *Nag's-Head*, he preſumed to offer himſelf to her, ſhe would have ſent her new Metropolitan to that Hoſpital, to enjoy the Satisfaction of his Advancement in the Society of Lunaticks there? Or muſt we not think of him, that it was his Deſire to be there or any where elſe rather than at *Lambeth*; and that what he did at the Tavern was in order to carry on his Deſign of delivering himſelf from the Burthen of that great Charge which he had been ſo much afraid of, and to fruſtrate the Attempts of the Queen and her Miniſters, by putting it out of their Power to accompliſh their Intentions of raiſing him to a Poſt for which he had an utter Averſion? This Pains he muſt, according to *Champney*, be ſuppoſed to take, *ut fabula fieret*, for no other Purpoſe but to make himſelf the Jeſt and Sport of all Perſons, Friends and Enemies, Proteſtants, and Papiſts or Puritans. The like Frenzy muſt have

have poſſeſſed the other Prelates, who were intended to be his Suffragans. Some of them had been nominated and elected to their Sees before or ſoon after him, but were by Law to be confirmed and conſecrated before they could be in compleat Poſſeſſion of their Biſhopricks; and for their Confirmation and Conſecration the Queen's Mandate was to be iſſued out to the Arch-Biſhop, after his own Conſecration was over; as it was for ſome of them the very Day after he was conſecrated, *Decemb.* 18. They were ſure, that in due time their own Conſecration would follow his; and as ſure, that without being confirmed by his Authority they could not have any Benefit of their Election, or of any other Conſecration, upon their being elected only, without that Election being confirmed: But *Parker*'s Example, we muſt preſume, encouraged them not to wait ſo long, but to make uſe of the Opportunity of being conſecrated at the ſame Time and Place, and in the ſame Manner with their Metropolitan, inſtead of ſtaying till he ſhould be inveſted with Authority to give them a legal Confirmation and Conſecration; that is, we muſt ſuppoſe, they were in a Humour likewiſe to go and bear him Company in *Bedlam*, rather than to wait ſo long as till they might have a legal Right and Title to ſit together with him upon the Biſhops Bench. This is an Inſtance of *Nolumus Epiſcopari*, a Declaration that they were reſolved to be No Biſhops; the like of which was never heard of before or ſince. And can we believe that their Writers were in earneſt, when they give the World ſuch an Account of the Conduct of our Arch-Biſhop and Biſhops? Or that they had any other Deſign than to make a pleaſant Story of it, to expoſe the Reformed Church of *England*, and to divert their Catholick Readers?

4. And

The Pretence falſe that they were forced, by the Popiſh Biſhops refuſing to ordain them.

4. And what Neceſſity are our Prelates ſuppoſed to be under of getting themſelves to be thus conſecrated? It was, becauſe all their Biſhops, and *Landaff* beſides, had refuſed to conſecrate *Parker* and his Brethren. But this Pretence is enough to deſtroy the Credit of the Tavern-Ordination, if it be ſuppoſed to be done at *Champney*'s time. It muſt have been, according to him, ſome time before the ninth of *September*, becauſe, as he attempts to prove, [s] *Parker* muſt have been compleatly Arch-Biſhop before that Day. If ſo, then all the Popiſh Biſhops muſt have, before that time, refuſed to conſecrate him, and he have been forced, upon their rejecting him, to get himſelf conſecrated at the *Nag's-Head*. Could then all the Popiſh Biſhops have refuſed, and yet three of them, *Tonſtall* of *Durham*, *Bourne* of *Bath* and *Wells*, and *Poole* of *Peterborough*, be named and required to be his Conſecrators in the Queen's *Mandate* that paſſed the Seal the ninth of *September*? If they had refuſed before that time, and he thereupon had been otherwiſe conſecrated, could it be poſſible for the Government at that time to appoint thoſe three Biſhops to be of the Number of his Conſecrators? Or if *Landaff* too had refuſed, could he have been appointed for one in this Commiſſion, and in a ſecond in *December*, three Months after? So well does this pretended Fact agree with the time alloted for it in the Hiſtorian.

We need not diſpute whether *Tonſtall*, *Bourne*, and *Poole*, the three Popiſh Biſhops in the Commiſſion of *September* 9, refuſed to join with the reſt in conſecrating *Parker*; their Refuſal, it is probable, occaſioned that Commiſſion not to be executed. But had *Parker*, upon this Diſappoint-

[s] P. 507, 508.

ment,

ment, no other Way to turn himſelf, but by ſtealing a Sham-Ordination at the Tavern? Three of the ſix Biſhops named in the Commiſſion had refuſed to act; but the other three, *Landaff*, *Barlow*, and *Scory*, had not refuſed; and if he had been conſecrated by theſe three, it would have been a Canonical Conſecration in reſpect of the Number, and in all other reſpects it might have been agreeable both to the Canons of the Church, and the Laws of the Realm; only it would not have been legal, for want of a fourth Conſecrator, which the *Statute* of *Hen.* VIII. required. And could *Parker*, if he were in his Wits, and there were a Neceſſity for him to be conſecrated at that time, not chuſe to be conſecrated by theſe three, rather than (as *Champney* makes him) by one of them only, and that in a manner not in any way conformable to Law or Religion?

But it is plain that he could have no ſuch Thoughts of departing from the Courſe preſcribed by Law, from a Paper [h] tranſcribed by Mr. *Strype* from the Paper-Office, relating to what was by Law to be done, after his Election to the Arch-Biſhoprick. It was drawn up, it appears, by *Parker* himſelf, and communicated by him to Secretary *Cecil*, and conſidered of by both of them, as appears by the Notes in the Margin, one of which is known by Mr. *Strype* to be *Parker*'s, and three others to be Secretary *Cecil*'s own Hand. At what time ſoever it paſſed between him and the Secretary, it could not be till after the Queen's Mandate of the ninth of *September* had paſſed the Seal, and the three Popiſh Biſhops named there for ſome of his Conſecrators had, as it is probable, refuſed to pay Obedience to it. This appears from *Cecil*'s Note, wherein he objects to *Parker*, that there was *not any Arch-Biſhop, or*

[h] Life of Matth. Parker, p. 40.

four

four Biſhops, to confirm and conſecrate him, whereas there were *four Biſhops* named in that Mandate, in actual Poſſeſſion of four Epiſcopal Sees, *Landaff* having kept his Biſhoprick by taking the Oath of the Queen's Supremacy, and the Oath not being yet tendered to the other three, ſo that they could not yet be deprived. The Arch-Biſhop Elect ſets down in this Paper the Method that he underſtood was by Law to be obſerved, in order to compleat his Promotion to the Arch-Biſhoprick. "That the Queen's Letters Patents ſhould "be directed to any Arch-Biſhop within the "King's Dominions, or to Four Biſhops. That "Fealty ſhould be done to the Queen for his "Temporalties, and the Oath taken, and the "Fees paid to the Officers. That the Conſe-"cration ſhould be on a *Sunday*, in a proper "Place. And that the Order of King *Ed-"ward*'s Book ſhould be obſerved in the Con-"ſecration." If this Paper be genuine and authentick, as the very Hands of *Parker* and *Cecil* in the Margin (known to be theirs) prove it to be, it ſhews firſt, that we cannot, without the greateſt Abſurdity, conceive that *Parker* had been actually made Arch-Biſhop before the time that the Paper paſſed thro' his and *Cecil*'s Hands; becauſe we find them both at this time adviſing with one another about the Method of compleating his Advancement to the Arch-Biſhoprick. And how then can we ſuppoſe him to have been in compleat Poſſeſſion of that Dignity, as *Champney* makes him, before the ninth of *September*? Secondly, neither can it be imagined that he had, at the time when he drew up this Paper and ſent it to the Secretary, the leaſt Thoughts of taking any other Steps for his Promotion than ſuch as were preſcribed by Law; and if he was in this Mind after the Popiſh Biſhops had refuſed to confirm and conſecrate him, how can we conceive

that

that their Refusal made him so desperate, as immediately to lay aside all Thoughts of being promoted in a legal Way, and to run madly to get himself consecrated at the Tavern?

'Tis true, upon *Tonstall*, *Bourne* and *Poole*'s declining to pay Obedience to the Queen's Mandate of *September* 9. there was but one Person left in full Possession of an Episcopal See, the Bishop of *Landaff*; *Barlow* and *Scory*, the other two named in that Mandate, having been ejected in Queen *Mary*'s time, and not either restored to their former Sees, or put into Possession of others, and all the rest of the Protestant Bishops being likewise deprived in that Reign, and none of them yet restored. And this we must conceive to be *Cecil*'s Meaning, when he tells *Parker* that *there were not four Bishops*; that is, not four compleatly invested with the Spiritualties and Temporalties of their Bishopricks, so as to make them Bishops to all Intents and Purposes in the Eye of the Law. But there is no question but this Difficulty suggested by him was taken into Consideration both by him and *Parker*; and what was afterwards resolved upon by the Government, as a sufficient Remedy for it, appears by the Queen's second Mandate and Commission, issued out in *December* following, directed to *Landaff*, *Barlow*, and *Scory*, the three last in the former Commission, and to four others; with Authority to any four of them to confirm and consecrate *Parker*; and a Clause supplying, by the Queen's Supreme Authority, any Defect in their Persons, which might be looked upon to render any of them unqualified to execute the Commission in confirming and consecrating the Arch-Bishop elect.

Here *Le Quien* [i], who is so forward as to dispute whether Queen *Elizabeth*'s Commissions (all

[i] Tom. 1. p. 364, &c. 396.

but

but ſuch as ſerve his Turn) are not Forgeries, and the *Remarker* [k], who runs down *Bramhall* for begging the Point in Diſpute, by his calling what *Sanders* ſays (that they had not two or three Biſhops) *a ſhameleſs Untruth, becauſe the Queen's Commiſſion names ſeven*; (which he interprets to be ſetting up a forged Commiſſion againſt *Sanders*'s authentick Hiſtory) may ſee their bold Surmiſe corrected by the very *Nag's-Head Writers* themſelves. *Fitz-Simon* owns that *Landaff* was [l] *commiſſioned in the firſt place by Queen* Elizabeth; which could be only in her Letters Patents of *Dec.* 6. 1559. ſo that he muſt be looked upon to acknowledge her Commiſſion to *Landaff*, *Barlow*, *&c.* of that Date. And *Champney* [m] himſelf forms his laſt Argument to prove that *Barlow* was no Biſhop, upon the Words of this Commiſſion, wherein he ſays the Queen appointed *Parker*'s Conſecrators, and put *Barlow* in the ſecond place after *Landaff*; which in his Opinion ſhe could not have done, nor would *Barlow* have ſubmitted to it, if he had been really Biſhop; becauſe if he was, he had his Conſecration four Years at leaſt before *Landaff*; and therefore *Landaff*, being junior Biſhop, could not pretend to take Place of him. The whole almoſt of the Queen's Mandate he tranſcribes from Mr. *Maſon*, with the Names of ſix others after *Landaff*, appointed for *Parker*'s Conſecrators, and the Date of it at the End, *Dec.* 6. *Ann.* 2 *Eliz.* and then proceeds to draw his Argument from it to diſprove *Barlow*'s having been ever conſecrated Biſhop; and to *give the beſt Light*, as he ſays, *from this Matter to the whole Diſpute about our Orders*, he introduces upon this Occaſion *his whole Narrative* of the Ordination at the *Nag's-Head*.

[k] P. 93, 94. [l] Sup. p. 12. [m] P. 493, & ſeq.

5. To

6. To paſs by the Weakneſs of his Argument, (from which it muſt be concluded with equal Certainty, that *Landaff* himſelf never had Epiſcopal Conſecration, becauſe if he had it was in King *Henry*'s Reign; and yet in Queen *Elizabeth*'s Mandate of *September* 9. two Biſhops, not made till Queen *Mary*'s time, *Gilbert Bourne* of *Bath* and *Wells*, and *David Poole* of *Peterborough*, are placed above him; which, according to our Author, could not be done by the Queen, nor would *Landaff* have ſubmitted to it, if he had been really Biſhop) and to wave likewiſe his ridiculous and ſcandalous Suppoſition, that the Queen would appoint any Perſon to be Conſecrator of Arch-Biſhop *Parker*, who ſhe knew had not himſelf ever had any Conſecration to the Epiſcopal Order; let us attend the Doctor of the *Sorbonne*, in what follows after this weighty Argument. He finds it proper to enquire, [n] how it could be poſſible for *Landaff*, to whom the Queen had done ſo great Honour as to place him at the Head of the Commiſſion, not to perform the Office of Principal Conſecrator, to which he was called by the Queen's Mandate. He anſwers, there was a very plain Reaſon, "That he was not willing "to be guilty of ſo great Wickedneſs and Sacri-"ledge, nor to incur the Eccleſiaſtical Cenſures "which Biſhop *Bonner* threatened him with; "yet for fear of the Diſpleaſure of the Queen "and her Council, (Senate he calls it) he excuſed "himſelf upon a Pretence of his Feebleneſs and "the Weakneſs of his Sight." And this leads him to give us, in the two following Pages, his whole Narrative, which I have [o] already laid before the Reader. For *Landaff*'s Scrupulouſneſs in Point of Conſcience, *Champney* himſelf in the

Champney's Introduction to his Narrative.

[n] P. 496. [o] Sup. p. 17, 18, 19.

next Page only ſays *perhaps* he was *touched in Conſcience*; but even that he ſays without the leaſt Ground, *Landaff*, whatever *Wickedneſs and Sacrilege* there might be in the Action, being prepared and reſolved notwithſtanding to come to the Place, and to begin and go thro' with the Proceeding, if the thundering Meſſage from *Bonner* had not obliged him to deſiſt. But what was the Action wherein he ſays there was ſo great Wickedneſs and Sacrilege? Has he the Confidence to mean by it the executing the Queen's Mandate for the Confirmation and Conſecration of Arch-Biſhop *Parker*? Or does he mean that Ceremony which *Landaff* came to the Tavern to perform? The latter, agreeably to the Place, might probably have been ſuch as to deſerve that Name; but the former, if done according to the Tenor of the Queen's Commiſſion, would have been as agreeable to Religion, and to the Laws of Church and State, as any Ordinations of Biſhops, at that time and ever ſince in the Church of *Rome*.

His Inconſiſtency with himſelf, in regard to the time.

7. But we may now conſider how little Credit is to be given to the Story, upon a View of the Relation we have of it in their laſt and principal Hiſtorian. And firſt we may obſerve, how inconſiſtent he is with himſelf in his Account of the time of this pretended Fact. We ſee, if we are to regard what he ſays here, that it was after the ſixth of *December*, 1559. 2 *Eliz.* after *Landaff* was named to be Principal Conſecrator. This the Author himſelf owns, when he recites the Queen's Mandate of this Date; as he does without any other Reflections, but only ridiculouſly noting in the Margin [p], how ſhe took upon her to act as a *She-Pope*, and required all things to be done, not, (as he ſays ſhe ought) *according to the*

[p] P. 494.

Form

Form of the Canons and the Church's Practice and Ceremonial; but, *according to the Form of the Statutes ſet out and provided in that Behalf:* But he does not offer to ſuppoſe, either that there was no ſuch Mandate, or that it bore any other Date. And yet within a few Pages [q] we find him labouring, by an Argument of like weight with the former, to prove from *Parker*'s, the Arch-Biſhop elect, taking place of *Barlow*, then only Biſhop elect of *Chicheſter*, at the Celebration of the Obſequies of the *French* King, the eighth and ninth of *September*, that the former muſt undoubtedly be at that time compleatly Arch-Biſhop, and conſequently was not conſecrated at *Lambeth*, which we own was not till *December*, but at the *Nag's-Head*, three Months before. His Concluſion indeed is no more but that we muſt grant, either that *Parker* had been conſecrated before that time in *September*, or that his Principal Conſecrator *Barlow* was no Biſhop; both of which (tho' his Argument, he owns, can prove no more than one of the two) he declares, without any farther Reaſon, *that he believes to be true*; but his confidently telling us what he believes, can be of no Weight with any one that ſees that he could believe and relate it to be Fact, that the Tavern-Ordination was both in *September*, and in *December* three Months after. I need not mention the farther Abſurdity, let it be at either of the Times, of his making all the Biſhops conſecrated at a time, before any one of them was confirmed, and before ſome of them had ſo much as a *Conge d'Eſlire* from the Queen for their Election.

8. From this Obſervation of his Exactneſs and Conſiſtency in the Circumſtance of Time, we may paſs on to the Story itſelf. And firſt we may obſerve, *His abſurd Repreſentation of* Landaff's *Attempt to pay Obedience to*

[q] P. 507, 508.

Queen Elizabeth's *Mandate.*

ſerve, that he repreſents the Biſhop of *Landaff*[r] as reſolved, till *Bonner*'s Meſſage ſtop'd him, to pay an Obedience to the Queen's Mandate, and accordingly brings him to the Place where the Action was to be performed. But to what Place? The *Nag's-Head* Tavern. Did the Queen's Commiſſion either require him or give him Authority to hold a Conſecration in ſuch a Place? The Words of the Mandate require that all things be done *according to the Form of the Statutes in that Caſe provided*; and the Statutes, whether we take it of 25 *Hen.* VIII. which preſcribes the uſe of the *Pontifical*, or of King *Edward*'s Statutes, which appoint his Form of Conſecration to be uſed, allow of none other but a conſecrated Place, a Church or Chapel; and can our Hiſtorian be ſo abſurd us to make *Landaff*, in Obedience to theſe Statutes, and the Queen's Mandate, intend to perform the Office, not in a Church or Chapel, but in a Tavern? *Champney*[s] himſelf expreſly owns, that tho' (as Mr. *Maſon* tells him) *Parker* and our Prelates *had all the Churches open for them*, yet they had *no Hopes of bringing* Landaff *to their Churches*, and therefore *made Choice of ſuch a Place as he would come to without Scruple.* The *Engliſh* Churches and Chapels had been, in his Opinion, all deſecrated or laid under an Interdict, from *Midſummer* foregoing, at which time the *Breviary*, *Miſſal*, *Pontifical*, *&c.* had been ordered to be thrown out, and the Reformed Liturgy and other Offices to be uſed in the Place of them: And that Biſhop, if we believe this Writer, notwithſtanding his renouncing the Pope, was yet ſo firm in his Adherence to that Religion, that his Conſcience would not allow him to officiate, not ſo much, we muſt ſuppoſe, as in his own Cathedral, nor in any other Place which had been pro-

[r] P. 496. [s] P. 500, 501.

faned

faned by the *Engliſh* Service; tho' the generality of the Catholicks came duly for ten Years after to our Churches, and joined in the publick Offices there. But here *Le Quien*'s Improvement of the Story will come in to give us a little Diverſion; *Champney*, to excuſe their making Choice of a Place ſo undecent as the Tavern, ſays it could not be helped, becauſe *Landaff* could not bear to be within the Inſide of a Proteſtant Church: But *Le Quien*[t], to take off the Indecency, diſcovers, from *Kelliſon's Index*, that there was a *Chapel* in this *Grand Hôtell* (as he is willing to make it inſtead of a Tavern) and what is the Fruit of this happy Invention, but to make it neceſſary for *Landaff* to run away again from the Tavern, as ſoon as he ſaw a Chapel there opened for him? So happy is the Doctor of the *Sorbonne* in having *Le Quien* come in to his Aſſiſtance.

But it is not only in the Choice of the Place, that *Champney* expoſes himſelf, in the Way which he makes *Landaff* intend to take, of paying Obedience to the Queen's Mandate. The Mandate, it is plain, requires the Commiſſioners to confirm and conſecrate the Arch-Biſhop elect, but without a Word of their being to do the like Offices for any other Perſon. But the Hiſtorian makes him, in order to the Execution of his Commiſſion, agree to meet no fewer than fourteen more of our Prelates beſides *Parker*, with a Deſign to confer upon them all at once the Epiſcopal Order. This, 'tis true, was a Miſtake on the right Side, an high Act of Supererogation, to conſecrate fifteen Biſhops inſtead of one, and to do the Queen and the Proteſtant Church of *England* ſo much more Service than they expected, towards the erecting of their new Hierarchy. But was not *Landaff*

[t] T. 1. p. 218.

ſo wiſe as to ſee, what Thanks or Reward he had Reaſon to expect for this Inſtance of his Obedience and Complaiſance to the Queen? No other, than to be at Mercy, whether he ſhould ſuffer the ſevere Penalty of the Statute 25 *Hen.* VIII. for taking upon him to conſecrate any Biſhop without Authority from the Queen's Letters Patents directed to him. If by his Refuſal the Queen's Mandate had not been executed, the worſt Effect of it would have been no more than his incurring a *præmunire* for his Diſobedience; but here he is made ſo forward to obey it, as wiſely to lay himſelf open to the Penalty of a *præmunire*, by his Zeal to over-act his Part, and to do ſo much more than his Duty required.

With the ſame Wiſdom he is made to think of executing that Part of the Mandate which regards the Perſons that were put into Commiſſion. They were himſelf, in the firſt Place, and ſix more; but did his being the firſt Commiſſioner give him a Command or Allowance to perform the Ceremony alone by himſelf? No, it could not be done without four at leaſt of the Perſons named joining in the Action. So that here again he is repreſented as taking ſuch a Way of complying with the Queen's Orders, as rendered him as much obnoxious to the Laws and the Government, as if he had refuſed to execute them.

It is the ſame again as *Champney* makes him intend to conſecrate Arch-Biſhop *Parker*, without firſt confirming his Election to the Arch-Biſhoprick: The Mandate, it is plain, required him to be firſt confirmed, and then conſecrated; and the Queen's ſignifying her Aſſent to the Election, was no more than proviſional; that is, if in the Proceſs of *Confirmation*, upon a legal Enquiry into the Method of Election by the Chapter, and the Qualifications of the Perſon elected, it ſhould be found that the Election was lawful and valid and

ought to be confirmed: So that to conſecrate any Perſon without a preceding Confirmation of his Election, would have been, in the Eye of the Law, to conſecrate him without the proper Aſſurance of his being qualified for the Epiſcopal Order. Could then *Champney* pretend to make *Landaff* diſpoſed to do what the Mandate, according to Law, required him to do, and yet to neglect the firſt thing that was to be done, to confirm the Arch-Biſhop elect; but inſtead of that to proceed to give him Conſecration before his Election was confirmed; that is, to diſobey the Queen's Mandate, in order to pay a more ready Obedience to it? That Biſhop could not be ignorant of the tenor of his Commiſſion, nor of the Practice of confirming Biſhops eſtabliſhed by Law, ten Years before his Promotion to *Landaff*, and obſerved both in his Caſe, and in that of all the following Biſhops during the reſt of King *Henry*'s Reign, and revived again by Act of Parliament, 1 *Eliz.* How could he then have an Intention to execute his Commiſſion, in Compliance with the Queen's Commands, and yet come prepared to neglect the Execution of it in the firſt Act which he was commanded to perform?

9. But whatever were his Thoughts or Intentions, the Arch-Biſhop whom he was to confirm and conſecrate, knew he could not be made Arch-Biſhop without the Way preſcribed by Law being obſerved; and conſequently muſt inſiſt upon it with him, or the other Commiſſioners, that they ſhould firſt proceed to examine and confirm his Election; and this firſt Part of their Duty the Commiſſioners in the firſt place muſt either conſent to do, or refuſe. And this leads us to a pretty clear Evidence, that *Landaff* could never have an Opportunity to come to the Tavern in order to *conſecrate* Arch-Biſhop *Parker*. If he refuſed,

Landaff could have no Opportunity of coming to the Tavern to conſecrate Parker.

as they pretend, to execute his Commiſſion, his Refuſal muſt firſt be of that Part which was firſt to be executed, *Parker*'s Confirmation; and then there was no room for him to be called upon to conſecrate him, if four others of the Commiſſioners were ready and willing to do it without him. And this agrees with the Matter of Fact as it ſtands upon Record in *Parker*'s Regiſter. The Commiſſion bears Date, *Dec.* 6. 1559. and on that very Day [v] the four Commiſſioners after *Landaff*, *Barlow*, *Scory*, *Coverdale*, and *Hodgskin*, took it upon them to execute the Commiſſion, and directed a Mandate to certain Perſons to cite all ſuch as had any thing to object againſt the Arch-Biſhop's Election, to appear at *Bow Church*, on the ninth of that Month; and on the ſeventh Day *Parker* [w], by an Inſtrument of that Date, deputed Dr. *May* and *Bullyngham*, or either of them, to appear for him before thoſe four Biſhops, and to be confirmed, by them, in his Name; as the latter of them was accordingly upon the ninth of the ſame Month. Here we ſee *Landaff* is left out, upon the very Day of the Date of the Letters Patents, wherein he was appointed the firſt Commiſſioner, and the four next took it upon them that Day to act without him; and *Parker*'s Proxy was directed the next Day to appear before thoſe four only for his Confirmation; and he received it from them, in the Perſon of his Proxy Dr. *Bullyngham*, two Days after. Let it be, if they pleaſe, that *Landaff* preſently declared his Unwillingneſs to bear a Part in confirming him, as he was required by the Queen's Mandate; can we ſuppoſe that *Parker* muſt not ſee by his refuſing to confirm him, that he had no Grounds to ſhew him that Reſpect as to court him afterwards

[v] Bramhall's Works, p. 1028, 1029, 1030. [w] Ibid. p. 1027, 1028.

to

to be his Conſecrator, and run the Hazard of a ſecond Refuſal, but rather to receive his Conſecration from the ſame four that, upon *Landaff*'s declining it, took it upon them to execute the Mandate, which any four of the ſeven Perſons named were empowered to do? Can we farther ſuppoſe him to be ſo wild and frantick, as to chuſe rather to be conſecrated by *Landaff* alone, than by the Number expreſly required to make his Conſecration valid in Law, and by whom he had been already confirmed?

The Story itſelf will not allow it to be ſuggeſted, that *Landaff* came to the Place with an Intention firſt to confirm *Parker*'s Election, and then to conſecrate him. It ſays that he came upon *an Invitation* from our Prelates, and that [x] *by him they expected to be ordained*; and that *Bonner*'s Meſſage was to threaten him with Excommunication if he *ordained them*; and that being frightned by this Meſſage he excuſed himſelf from performing the Ceremony of Conſecration, and *Scory* took that Office upon him, and performed the Ceremony, after *Landaff* had refuſed; and yet his Refuſal muſt firſt have been of confirming *Parker*, that being the firſt Act he was to do in Execution of the Queen's Mandate; and upon his refuſing to do that, and it being done by others of the Commiſſioners without him, there was no Occaſion for his being *invited* or *expected* afterwards to conſecrate the Arch-Biſhop whom he had denied to confirm: And ſo there is an End of the Story of his meeting *Parker* for that purpoſe, as well as ſo many others of our Prelates, who, as it is pretended, expected their Conſecration from him. *Champney* might very eaſily have brought him to the Tavern with an Intention to confirm *Parker*, as well as to conſecrate him, and

[x] Sup. p. 17.

then

then have told us that *Bonner* by his threatning Meſſage obliged him to excuſe himſelf from proceeding either in the one or the other Part of what he was otherwiſe reſolved to do in Obedience to the Queen's Mandate. But for the Hiſtorian to have the very Words of the Mandate lying before him, wherein the Commiſſioners are required firſt to confirm and then to conſecrate the Arch-Biſhop elect, and to repreſent *Landaff* as prepared and reſolved, in point of Duty and Reſpect, to pay an Obedience to the Queen's Commands by executing his Commiſſion in every Particular, if *Bonner* had not interpoſed and forbid him: To introduce his Relation of the Story in this manner, and yet preſently to make that Biſhop forget or neglect the firſt thing he had to do, and to take ſuch a ſtrange Courſe of obeying the Mandate, by intending to act contrary to it in ſo many other Inſtances, this may ſatisfy us what Credit we ought to give to this Writer, and the Hiſtory he pretends to relate.

Champney's Relation abſurd in the Account of Bonner *and* Neale.

10. What has been ſaid is upon Suppoſition of the Fact having been as *Champney* relates it, that *Landaff* was with *Parker* and the reſt of our Biſhops at the Tavern; tho' we have (as has been [y] ſhewed) as good Authority from others of the *Nag's-Head* Writers, who vouch *Neale* (as poſitively as *Champney* does) for their Account of the Tradition, to believe that he never came at all to the Place, but was at the moſt only expected to come thither. But to go on in the Writer who is at preſent of greateſt Authority with the Party; his following Account of *Bonner* and *Neale* appears to deſerve as little Credit as what he gives, in the beginning, of *Landaff*. He, as [z] *Sacroboſco* before him, brings this Biſhop and our Pre-

[y] Sup. p. 77, 78. [z] Sup. p. 9.

lates

lates to the Meeting before *Bonner* had any Notice of it; but how after they were met an Account of it ſhould be carried to *Bonner* in Priſon, and *Neale* being then with him, ſhould be ſent to the *Nag's-Head*, and get thither before any thing of the Buſineſs was done for which they were met together, it is hard to conceive. If *Parker*'s Confirmation were to have been entered upon in the firſt place, *Neale* might have come in good time to have prevented the Conſecration; or he might have been there perhaps before the Oppoſers againſt the Arch-Biſhop's Election had been the laſt time publickly cited to appear and be heard, and ſo have put a Stop to the Proceſs of the Confirmation till his Objections had been taken into Conſideration. But, for ought appears in the Story, nothing was done before he came, but (as the impudent Author of the *Nullity* bears us in hand) making uſe of [a] *the Key of the Cellar, inſtead of the Key of Order*, and putting the Bottle to *Landaff*, [b] *with good Words and good Cups to bring the Old Man to a good Humour.* This is all the Account we have of what was done in the mean time, inſtead of what elſe might have been expected from *Champney* himſelf. But to come to *Bonner*'s Meſſage by *Neale:* That Biſhop had been lately deprived of his Biſhoprick, and after that removed to a Priſon, (inſtead of his Palace at *London-Houſe*) and whatever Temper and Spirit he might be of, one would think he ſhould not be very forward to bring upon himſelf any farther Sufferings. And yet the Story makes him ſo fool-hardy and deſperate as to ſend, even from his Priſon, an Inhibition to *Landaff*, requiring him, under pain of Excommunication, not to obey the Queen's Mandate. The *Statute* 25 *Hen.* VIII. makes it a *præmunire* for any Perſon to *obey or*

[a] P. 14. [b] P. 78.

execute

execute any Interdict or Inhibition contrary to the Preſcript of that *Statute* about the Manner of making the *Engliſh* Biſhops; that is, it ſubjects the Perſons to the Loſs of their Offices and Eſtates, and of the Protection of the Government, and of their Liberty during the King or Queen's Pleaſure. And would not the Statute that involves the Perſon who obeys ſuch an Inderdict in that ſevere Penalty, fall more heavy upon a Subject that dares to iſſue out ſuch an *Interdict and Inhibition, to the Lett of the due Execution of this Statute*, and to require any other Perſon not to pay Obedience to it under the pain of Excommunication? eſpecially if he, who takes upon him to threaten the Perſon he ſent his Meſſage to with ſuch a Cenſure, was himſelf by Law lately diveſted of all Authority to exerciſe any Part of the Epiſcopal Juriſdiction, and yet had the Boldneſs, in Defiance of the Law, to act as if he were in full Poſſeſſion of that Authority? Could *Bonner* think that this Audaciouſneſs would not be made known to the Government by his Enemies the Proteſtant Prelates? And if it were, could he expect any thing leſs than that the utmoſt Severity of the Law ſhould be executed upon him? But ſuppoſing him to be ſo mad as to take ſuch a deſperate Courſe in regard to his own Perſon, could he think, or can we believe, that *Landaff*, who had lately taken an Oath wherein he renounced the Pope's Authority, and ſtood Proof againſt any *Anathema* from the See of *Rome* upon that account, ſhould be ſo fearful of incurring a Cenſure of Excommunication from a Biſhop who he knew had no See, but had been deprived of that he was in Poſſeſſion of, and of the Juriſdiction that attended it; a Biſhop, who tho' he had ſtill retained his Juriſdiction over his former Dioceſe, could not yet with any Face pretend to exclude our Prelates from being conſecrated in any of the

ſeveral

ſeveral Churches in *London*, which owned no Dependence upon his Authority, but were wholly exempt from it; ſhould *Landaff*, I ſay, ſtand in ſo much Awe of his bold threatning Meſſage, as to chuſe rather to obey his Inhibition than the Queen's Mandate, and ſo to make himſelf liable, if, by his Default, the Mandate ſhould not be executed, to a Forfeiture of that Biſhoprick which he had ſaved by his former Compliance, and to all the other Penalties inflicted by the Statute of *Hen.* VIII. which would have left him nothing but his Life, without any other Comfort or Support? Could *Bonner* be ſo vain, as to promiſe himſelf that this Biſhop (how timorous ſoever *Champney* repreſents him, to give ſome Colour to this Part of the Story) ſhould be ſo much at his Command, and not rather have juſt Reaſon to apprehend, that his Fears of the Government would incline him to be ſo officious as to betray the confident Prelate, who in Oppoſition to the Law had ordered ſuch an Interdict to be ſerved upon him? Here the Hiſtorian ſhould have conſidered, whether his making *Bonner* act ſuch a Part, and *Landaff* to be influenced by him to do the like, can be looked upon by any rational Man as any thing elſe but a groundleſs Fiction.

If we could ſuppoſe that *Bonner* himſelf might be ſo fearleſs and audacious, as to reſolve (how fatal ſoever the Conſequence might be to him) to make an Experiment whether his bold Pretence to the Authority which he had loſt would frighten *Landaff* into a Compliance with his Inhibition; it would ſtill be difficult to conceive that his Chaplain and Meſſenger *Neal*, who, if we take his Character from *Wood* [c], was not a Man of that Spirit and Courage, ſhould be ſo hardy as to go upon ſuch an Errand as might bring him into

[c] Athenæ Oxon. Vol. 1. p. 250.

the ſame Condition with his Lord, and expoſe him to a Forfeiture of his Profeſſorſhip at *Oxford*, and his other Preferments, and the Loſs of his Eſtate and Liberty. But let him be ſo obſequious to his Deprived Lord and Patron; we ſhall ſtill be almoſt under an Impoſſibility to find a Way for him, when he came to the Tavern, to be able to accompliſh his Deſign, firſt to deliver his Meſſage to *Landaff*, and to deal ſo effectually with him as to oblige him not to proceed in the Work he came for; and then after he had frightned him away, to ſtay and perform the other Part of his Errand, to ſee and hear what Meaſures *Parker* and his Brethren would take upon this Diſappointment. Both our Prelates and *Landaff* are ſuppoſed to be agreed to manage the Intrigue with all Privacy, and not to have any Perſons Witneſſes to it but themſelves, and ſuch as they could confide in. 'Tis ridiculous indeed, upon this Suppoſition, to think that they would lay the Scene in the midſt of *Cheapſide*, the moſt known and frequented Place in the City of *London*, and that in that Street they ſhould make Choice of no other Place for the Conſecration but a Publick Houſe, an Inn or Tavern, where the Door muſt always ſtand open for all Company that would come in. *Le Quien* and the *Remarker*, to prevent our wondering at their Choice, repreſent the Place as much more conſiderable than an ordinary Publick Houſe: The former [d], beſides the Diſcovery of a Chapel in it, gives us to underſtand that it was a *Great and Famous* Hôtel, *where the Biſhops uſed to lodge when they came to* London, *and where they ordinarily met to entertain one another*; the other [e] varies the Expreſſion a little, and ſays, only leaving out the Chapel as (poſſibly no more than a Jeſt of *Kelliſon*'s) it was *a great and*

[d] T. 1. p. 218. [e] P. 192.

uſual

uſual Place of Reſort for Numbers of conſiderable Clergymen and Biſhops when they met in Town. But they ſhould both have conſidered, that the greater and the more conſpicuous they make the Place, the leſs it muſt anſwer the Deſign of a ſtollen clancular Ordination; and that themſelves give us a quite contrary Repreſentation of it, when they come to urge it as a deciſive Proof of our firſt Biſhops being ordained at the *Nag's-Head*, that the Puritan Author of the *Demonſtration of the Diſcipline* makes the Ordinations of our Miniſters to be done *in a Corner*. *Le Quien* [f], without looking farther into the Author, makes no Difficulty to declare that he muſt be underſtood to ſpeak of the Ordinations of our firſt Biſhops; and that by their being done *in a Corner*, he muſt mean no other but the *obſcure* Place (as he is now willing to make it) of his Great and Famous *Hôtel*. The *Remarker* [g] takes *Le Quien*'s Word for it, and is ſo clear in the Matter, as to give the Place where our Biſhops were conſecrated, a new Name, of the [h] *Nag's-Head Corner*, meaning ſtill by that *Corner*, *A great and uſual Place of Reſort for Numbers of conſiderable Clergymen and Biſhops*. So eaſy is it for them to look upon the Place, firſt with one and then with the other End of the Proſpective, and to make it great and conſiderable, or mean and obſcure, as it beſt ſuits their Convenience.

But to paſs by theſe wiſe Improvements of the Story, and ſuppoſe our Prelates and their Conſecrators to be met at the Place; *Neale* muſt come either before the Company were all met and ready for Action, or after. If after, they muſt be ſuppoſed, before he came, as ſoon as all things were ready for the Conſecration, to ſhut themſelves up and lock the Door, and to order that no Perſon

[f] T. 1. p. 202, & ſeq. [g] P. 179, & ſeq. [h] P. 181.

be

be brought up to interrupt them during the Ceremony. How then could *Neale* get Admittance to execute his Commiſſion from *Bonner?* Suppoſe him then to come, before they were all met, and entering upon the Ceremony; would our Prelates permit a Perſon unknown to be brought in, of whom they had no Aſſurance but that he might, inſtead of a Friend, be an Enemy and a Spy upon them? Or if they knew him to be *Bonner*'s Chaplain, or a *Romaniſt*, would they be ſo eaſy and complaiſant as to let him make one among them, to be preſent the whole time, and to be a Witneſs of all their Debates and Conſultations, both while *Landaff* was with them and after? The *Remarker* reflects upon a [i] *ſmart Invention*, as he calls it, of [k] *Burnet*'s, that *Neale* got to ſee all that paſſed *by peeping through an Hole in the Door*. *Burnet*, 'tis true, ſays this without Book, not having read of this Circumſtance in any of the *Nag's-Head* Writers, who, tho' they all agree to make *Neale* preſent during the whole Tranſaction, yet were not any of them concerned to give us any probable Account how he got in; ſo that we are left to gueſs in what Manner; and if the Door, as it ought to have been, was kept ſhut, and no Perſon could be admitted but ſuch as our Prelates knew to be Friends, how could he ſee what was done but by finding out a Hole in the Door, and by that Means being a Spectator of all that paſſed, and an Eye and Ear-witneſs, as far as this Expedient would ſerve him? The *Remarker* offers us a *ſmarter Invention* of his own, that *Neale* might be brought in [l] *by the Conſent, and as a Companion, of* Landaff. 'Tis pity that none of the Hiſtorians thought of this Ground of making the Story more plauſible. It muſt require, that ſome Body ſhould come up from the Bar

[i] P. 192. [k] Hiſtory of Reform. Part 2. p. 403. [l] P. 192.

to

to *Landaff*, to call him out to a Stranger that waited to ſpeak with him; that the Biſhop coming out, *Neale* ſhould diſcover himſelf to him, and deliver his Meſſage; that *Landaff*, after ſome Surprize, ſhould firſt take a little time to conſider what he had to do, and then reſolve to ſubmit to *Bonner*'s Inhibition; and when he went in again take *Neale* with him to be a Witneſs of his Obedience. But what muſt *Parker* and his Brethren think of this Stranger, and his Buſineſs with *Landaff?* We muſt ſuppoſe them to have ſo great a Confidence in that Biſhop, as to believe any Friend of his to be *a true Man, and no Spy.* This they might, till they found in how little time after *Landaff* put a Trick upon them, and had loſt his Eyes ſince he went out and diſcourſed with this Stranger, whom he had brought in without aſking their Conſent. But when their Conſecrator refuſed the Office and withdrew, can it be ſuppoſed that this Friend of his ſhould be allowed to ſtay behind him, and to be preſent at their Conſultations what they had farther to do to get themſelves conſecrated? If he had not the Modeſty himſelf to quit the Place, ſure they muſt at leaſt have the Courage to diſmiſs him with Civility, except they could have full Aſſurance that he had a better Occaſion to ſtay and keep them Company.

The *Remarker*'s Fancy of *Landaff*'s doing *Neale* this Piece of Service is utterly diſcountenanced, if we take the Story, not from *Champney*, but from *Fitz-Simon* and *Parſons*'s *Prefacer*, who are poſitive that *Landaff* himſelf was never at the Meeting, but that it was only of our Prelates by themſelves, without him. If he was not there himſelf, how could he come out and bring in *Neale* as a *Friend and Companion?* Or if our Prelates were alone by themſelves, which of them will the *Remarker* tell us, *Scory*, or *Parker*, or

who elſe, acted the Part of a falſe Brother, and went and fetch'd in *Bonner*'s Spy? But it is not worth the while to debate how *Neale* could get his Intelligence, when nothing can be more plain than that he never ſaw or heard any ſuch Matter at the Tavern. If he did, and had that Succeſs in the Errand which he had in Charge from his Lord, is it poſſible that when he came back he ſhould make no Report of what paſſed to him? That *Bonner* ſhould never hear a Word of it from him, neither at that time, nor for five or ſix Years after? If that Biſhop had had an Account of it in that time, could he forget to make uſe of it in the Conteſt between him and *Horne*, when he had ſo great Neceſſity of proving before the Court of *King's-Bench*, that his Adverſary was no Biſhop, in order to ſave himſelf from being caſt in a *Præmunire?* All that is alledged by himſelf, or that his Council appear to have been prepared to offer, in Juſtification of his Plea that *Horne* was *No Biſhop*, and his whole Conduct while that Indictment lay againſt him, plainly ſhews (as will ſoon be made appear) that he was utterly ignorant of any ſuch Fact as *Horne*'s being ordained, together with *Parker* and the reſt of our firſt Biſhops, at the *Nag's-Head* Tavern; and if he was ignorant of it, his Chaplain muſt have had no more Knowledge of the Fact than he, or muſt have been very ſtupid to keep the Matter concealed from his Lord, who had expreſly ſent him to the Place, in order to bring him an Account of the Effect of his Meſſage to *Landaff*, and of every thing elſe that paſſed there.

The Abſurdity of his Account of Scory, *and the Conſe-*

11. The Account that follows, of what Meaſures *Parker* and his Brethren were forced to take, upon *Landaff*'s diſappointing them, deſerves no more Credit than what we have had before. *They addreſſed themſelves*, *Champney* ſays, *to* Scory,

whom ([m] as he tells us preſently after, in his Tranſcript from *Conſtable*'s MS.) *they had not thought of before.* But *Scory* had been twice appointed to be one of thoſe who were to confirm and conſecrate *Parker*, in the Mandate of *December* 6. recited by *Champney*, and in a former Mandate in *September*, three Months before; and he was not ſent for from the *Nag's-Head* to come thither to do the Office after *Landaff* had refuſed it, but had been there together with *Parker* and the other Prelates from their firſt coming, as we underſtand from their own Writers. But the Hiſtorian gives a Reaſon that ſhews *Parker* could have no Thoughts of him for his Conſecrator till he found himſelf under a Neceſſity; becauſe *he had* only *borrowed the Name of a Biſhop in King* Edward's *time, and had, without any Conſecration, unlawfully poſſeſſed himſelf of a Biſhoprick.* Is he not very abſurd in giving us his own forward Opinion of *Scory*'s Want of the Epiſcopal Order; as if without all queſtion *Parker* muſt have been of the ſame Opinion with him, and for that Reaſon be unwilling at firſt to apply to *Scory* for Conſecration? Have we not clear Grounds to believe that *Parker* muſt know that *Scory* had his Conſecration from *Cranmer*, in King *Edward*'s time, as well as *Landaff* had his in the Reign of his Father; and his Conſecration was no more defective for want of the Pope's Confirmation, than *Landaff*'s had been; and that to *Parker*, his being a Proteſtant as well as himſelf, could be no Objection againſt his being duly qualified to give him Ordination, nor his having been conſecrated by the Form in King *Edward*'s Ordinal, by which Form *Parker* himſelf deſired and expected to be conſecrated, and by no other? Upon what Motives therefore can it be ſuggeſted that

cration performed by him.

[m] P. 502. ſup. p. 8.

the Arch-Biſhop elect ſhould not find it in his Heart to think of him for his Conſecrator, as well as *Landaff*, being both named in the ſame Commiſſion? Does it not much rather appear, that the Inventor of the Fable, having laid his Plot to bring *Landaff* upon the Stage, and to drive him off again, found it neceſſary to bethink himſelf of ſome other Perſon to ſucceed him and ſupply his Place, and compleat the Mock-Conſecration; and without farther Conſideration pitched upon *Scory* for the Perſon to perform the Office?

But what Method does *Champney* make our Prelates, and their new Conſecrator *Scory*, whom they had prevailed upon to take that Office upon him, reſolve to take? *Landaff* had deſerted them, and withdrawn from the Tavern, [n] which Place, as *Champney* owns, they had made Choice of, to gratify that Biſhop's Averſion to a Proteſtant Church. And could they not ſee how much it became them, now they were at Liberty, to adjourn the Performance of a ſacred Office, and the Solemnities of Religion that were to attend it, to a Sacred Place, a Church or Chapel? But inſtead of that they appear not to have had any Thought but of continuing in the ſame ſcandalous Place where *Landaff* and they had met; and, conſidering what a Conſecration it was that followed, they had good Reaſon to ſtay where they were. A Conſecration, without any Act of religious Worſhip, tho' King *Edward*'s Ordinal preſcribed by the Law, and the Queen's Mandate, required the daily Service of the Church, and the *Litany*, to be read, a Sermon preached, and the Holy Communion adminiſtred, and a ſolemn Invocation to be made, in the Office, of the Bleſſed Spirit, to confer his Gifts and Graces upon the Perſons to be ordained: But in the Tavern-Conſecration,

[n] P. 500, 501.

they

they found no Room nor Occaſion for any thing of this, nor for the Impoſition of Hands preſcribed in the Ordinal, with the Form of Words annexed to it; but *Scory*, as we are told, *ſoon did the Buſineſs*, by a Ceremony preſented to him by his own Imagination, or invented for him by the Hiſtorian; tho' it is more decent in this Writer than the Mockery in the two Writers before him. This *Scory* is made to do, by the Conſent and at the Requeſt of *Parker* and his Brethren, beſides all the other Acts of Diſobedience to the Queen's Mandate, and the Statutes of the Realm, which *Landaff* had committed if he had ſtayed; the taking upon him to act by himſelf, without three more to join with him; to conſecrate, without Command or Leave from the Queen, fifteen Biſhops inſtead of one; to give them all Conſecration before their Elections were confirmed, and ſome of them before they were ſo much as elected: Whereas the Law expreſly required four Biſhops to join in the Confirmation and Conſecration of an Arch-Biſhop; and an Arch-Biſhop to confirm and conſecrate the Biſhops elect by himſelf, or by his Authority delegated to proper Perſons; and allowed no Perſon to be conſecrated without a preceding Confirmation of his Election, nor any Perſon to be either conſecrated or confirmed but ſuch only as were appointed to be confirmed and conſecrated by the Queen's Mandate: In all which Particulars, *Scory* and his Biſhops thought fit to act without any Regard either to the Laws or Religion, if the Story of this Conſecration is to be credited.

And can it be conceived, that Men in their Senſes (as they all appeared to be, before this Point of Time, and after, during their Lives) ſhould without any Neceſſity, when they had it fully in their Power to be conſecrated in the Manner preſcribed by Law, in regard to the Perſons,

and the Number of them, and the Place, Time, and the Ceremony of Conſecration; and when without being ſo conſecrated they could not hope to be admitted and owned for Biſhops; of their own Humour chuſe to have an Ordination contrary to the Forms of Law and Rules of Religion? which, inſtead of being approved of by the Government, and their Promotion to their Dignities being compleated in Conſequence of it, muſt have made void all that had been done for them already, in their Nominations and Elections, and in the Commiſſion for the Confirmation and Conſecration of the Arch-Biſhop elect; and beſides, have juſtly provoked the Queen to reject them utterly from having any Station or Office in the Church, and to puniſh them for their Diſobedience and Audaciouſneſs, by ordering both their Conſecrator *Scory* to be indicted of a *Præmunire* upon the *Stat.* 25 *Hen.* VIII. and *Parker* and his Brethren to be adjudged liable to the ſame Penalty, if the Intent of that Statute was (as the Words do ſufficiently appear to require to be underſtood) to make all the *Perſons that execute any Proceſs, or that do any Act, of what Nature, Name, or Quality ſoever it be, to the contrary or Lett of due Execution of that Statute about the making of our Biſhops*, guilty of a *Præmunire.* If they can be conceived to have been in their Wits, and yet to have acted in this manner directly contrary to their Duty and their Intereſt, then we may have Grounds to think it poſſible that *Champney*'s Account of their Conſecration may be real Matter of Fact, and not a ſilly, ill-contrived, and abſurd Romance.

The Romance would ſtill more diſcover itſelf, if the laſt Part of the Story, which we have from *Sacroboſco* and *Fitz-Simon*, and which I have before[o] ſhewed is enough by itſelf to deſtroy

[o] Sup. p. 133.

the Credit of the Whole, (*Scory*'s receiving the Epiſcopal Order from ſome of our Prelates, after he had taken it upon him to confer the ſame Order upon them) were not wanting in the Narrative of their laſt and principal Hiſtorian. His Omiſſion of it is unaccountable, if we conſider, that he does almoſt in every thing elſe only copy from *Sacroboſco*, and conſequently could not but have this Part, as well as the reſt of that Author's Relation, lying before him: And that himſelf tells us, he had ſet down [p] *the whole Relation as he had heard it from* Bluet *more than once, without adding or detracting any Word pertaining to the Subſtance of the Matter*; and yet owns, in the next Page after his Narrative [q], that *Sacroboſco* had the very ſame Relation from *Bluet*, being for ſome time Fellow-Priſoner with him in the Caſtle at *Wisbich*; ſo that he, as well as *Champney*, muſt have it from *Bluet* more than once: and if both of them had the whole Story from him, it follows that either he muſt have *detracted* (as he expreſſes himſelf) from it, or *Sacroboſco* muſt have made an Addition to it, without the Authority of *Bluet*'s Report. And this laſt muſt ſeem to be *Champney*'s Senſe, by his telling us this Tale ſoon after, of *Scory*'s being thus ordained, and making uſe of it to prove that he never had before any Epiſcopal Conſecration, but telling it not as his own or *Bluet*'s, but as *Sacroboſco*'s Story. I need not repeat what is ſaid elſewhere, that it was of the *greateſt Importance* (as *Fitz-Simon* ſays) that this laſt Act of the Comedy *ſhould not be concealed*, nothing being more proper to ſhew the Conſecration to be a mere Mockery; and therefore *Champney* cannot be conceived to have omitted it as not pertinent and material.

[p] Sup. p. 18. [q] P. 499. [r] P. 507. [s] Sup. p. 13, 92.

Our Biſhops Admiſſion into their Sees, and continuing in Poſſeſſion of them, impoſſible, if they were ordained at the Nag's-Head.

12. But let the Fact be as it will of the manner wherein our Biſhops had their Conſecration, this is certain, and our Adverſaries are ſorry they cannot deny it, that theſe Men, *Parker* and the reſt, got into Poſſeſſion of their Biſhopricks, and enjoyed them during their Lives: But how they could poſſibly be admitted for Biſhops, ſuppoſing the Fact of their being ordained at the *Nag's-Head*, the Story does not proceed to tell us, but leaves that inſuperable Difficulty to be ſolved by ourſelves. The Ordination, as they relate it, was deſigned by our Prelates to be clandeſtine and ſecret; and if they had a Reſolution to keep it concealed from the World, how could they be the better for it? How could the Government take any farther ſteps to compleat their Advancement to their Dignities, it being neceſſary that the Queen ſhould firſt be certified of their having been confirmed and conſecrated, before they could be admitted to do Homage, and be inſtalled in their Epiſcopal Chairs, and have a Writ to be put into Poſſeſſion of their Temporalties? If they ſaw a Neceſſity, upon this account, of departing from their Purpoſe of keeping it private, and certified the Queen of the naked Truth, that they had no other Conſecration but that which they are pretended to have had at the *Nag's-Head*; this Acknowledgment of their daring Violation of the Laws muſt have entitled them to no other Promotion but to a Priſon. How then could the *Nag's-Head* Writers contrive a way for them to certify the Government that they were conſecrated, and withal to compaſs their Deſign of being owned for Biſhops of the Church of *England?* It could be no other Way but by making them add the Crime of Forgery to their Sacrilege and Profaneneſs, and Diſobedience to the Laws; and to impoſe upon the

Queen by a falſe Certificate, of *Parker*'s being confirmed and conſecrated by four of the ſeven Perſons appointed in her Mandate, and of his having been conſecrated by King *Edward*'s Form required by Law; and by the like Certificates of the other Biſhops after him being, according to the reſpective Mandates for their Confirmation and Conſecration, confirmed by Arch-Biſhop *Parker*, after his own Conſecration was over, and conſecrated by him, with the Aſſiſtance of ſome of his own Conſecrators, or ſome whom he himſelf had firſt conſecrated. This we might well expect to have been the Concluſion of the Hiſtory, with ſuch Circumſtances as might ſhew how our Biſhops had the Dexterity to carry on the Attempt with Succeſs, and to make the Queen and her Miniſtry believe, that all had been done lawfully and regularly as her Mandates had required.

Their Pretence that the Parliament confirmed the Ordination at the Nag's-Head.

13. But by what we find in their Writers, there was no occaſion for our Prelates to diſſemble or diſguiſe the Truth of the Fact, becauſe not only the Queen and her Miniſters, but the Three Eſtates of the Realm aſſembled in Parliament were ready and willing to admit of theſe Prelates, upon the very foot of their having no better Ordination than that at the Tavern. So the Story is concluded in the two firſt from whom we have it, *Sacroboſco*, and the *Prefacer* to *Parſons*. The former, after producing his Vouchers, for that Part of the Story of *Scory*'s laying Hands on theſe Prelates, and *the Children being born without a Father*; and then ſome of them laying Hands upon him, and *the Father's being begotten by the Children*; after he had confirmed this by the Authority of the *Confeſſors*, from whom he had it, and they from *Neale*; to put the Matter

ter out of Diſpute, he adds[t], "And the Story "is confirmed by its being afterwards enacted "in Parliament, that theſe Parliamentary Pre-"lates ſhould be eſteemed lawful Biſhops." If the Parliament's requiring them to be owned for lawful Biſhops be a Confirmation of the Story, then the Parliament muſt be ſuppoſed to believe the Story, and to be ſatisfied of it by an Act of the Conſecration drawn up and atteſted at the *Nag's-Head*, or elſewhere, after the Ceremony. The *Prefacer* to *Parſons* is fully as plain and poſitive[u]. "This *Horſe-Head* ordering was after-"wards confirmed *ſynodically* by Parliament, "wherein they were acknowledged for true Bi-"ſhops; and it was farther enacted, That no "Man ſhould make any doubt or call in queſtion "that Ordination." Paſſing by his Reflection upon the Parliament, as taking upon them to paſs an Act in Spiritual Matters, which, in his wiſe Judgment, was out of their Sphere, and belonged only to a *Synod* of the Clergy: The Parliament he and *Sacroboſco* ſpeak of muſt be that 8 *Eliz.* wherein the Bill was brought in and paſſed, *declaring the Manner of making and conſecrating the Arch-Biſhops and Biſhops of this Realm to be good, lawful and perfect.* And could it be pretended that this Act declared the Tavern-Ordination to be ſuch? Yes, ſo we are to believe, if we have any regard for the Judgment or Veracity of theſe Writers, who give us this Interpretation of that Statute. But let us compare their Gloſs with the Text. The Act firſt lays down *ſome Authorities which allow and approve the making and conſecrating the Arch-Biſhops and Biſhops to be duly and orderly done according to the Laws*; as firſt the Statute 25 *Hen.* VIII. then the Stat. 5 and 6 *Edw.* VI.

[t] Sup. p. 9. [u] Sup. p. 11.

both

both revived by Queen *Elizabeth*; according to which Statutes they declare *the Queen's Arch-Biſhops and Biſhops*, ſince the time of her Acceſſion, *to have been elected, confirmed, and conſecrated.* And can theſe Statutes be ſaid to be underſtood by the Parliament, to *allow and approve of* what the Story tells us was done at the Tavern, as *duly and orderly done according to the Laws?* If a Tavern were the Place appointed or allowed by King *Edward*'s Ordinal for the Conſecration of Proteſtant Biſhops; or if the Ceremony which *Scory* is made to uſe either by *Champney*, or by *Fitz-Simon*, or *Parſons*'s *Prefacer*, without any divine Service, or religious Solemnity, be the ſame with that which is preſcribed in King *Edward*'s Form, *annexed*, as the Parliament tells us, *to the Book of Common Prayer*; then we may believe that the Lords and Commons had the *Nag's-Head* Conſecration in their Eye, when they declare, that *the Arch-Biſhops and Biſhops were conſecrated according to ſuch Order and Form, and with ſuch Ceremonies in and about their Conſecrations, as were allowed and ſet forth by the Act and Statute*, (5 and 6 Edw. VI.) *and the Order, annexed to the Book of Common Prayer.* And if it were paying the ſame Obedience to the Statute 25 *Hen.* VIII. for Arch-Biſhop *Parker* to be conſecrated by one Biſhop only, as by four; and for him to be conſecrated without any preceding Confirmation of his Election, were the ſame as for him to be firſt confirmed and then conſecrated: Or for the Biſhops to be conſecrated before they were confirmed by the Arch-Biſhop, or before ſome of them were elected by the Chapters, were the ſame as to have their Elections by the Chapters firſt, and then to be confirmed and conſecrated by the Arch-Biſhop: Or for fifteen Biſhops to be conſecrated together, without any Command or Leave by the Queen's Letters Patents but only for the Conſecration

ſecration of one Arch-Biſhop, were the ſame as for the Arch-Biſhop to be firſt conſecrated, and then to have a Command and Leave by Letters Patents from the Queen, in due Order to confirm and conſecrate the other fourteen after they had their reſpective Elections: If theſe two Sorts of Proceedings were one and the ſame, then the Parliament might be believed to declare, That the Arch-Biſhop and Biſhops, ordained at the Tavern, were elected, confirmed and conſecrated according to the Order ſet forth in the Act 25 *Hen.* VIII. of the Manner and Form how the Arch-Biſhops and Biſhops of the Realm ſhould be elected and made. But if their being made and conſecrated after the Manner related in the *Nag's-Head* Story be directly oppoſite to the Orders and Statutes of both theſe Princes, referr'd to in the Act 8 *Eliz.* then that Act of Parliament, inſtead of being, as theſe two Writers make it, a Confirmation of that Story, will, as long as it has a Place in our Statute-Book, be a ſtanding Declaration of the Falſhood and Forgery of that Story. So effectually do theſe Writers deſtroy the Credit of the Hiſtory which they relate, by referring us to that Parliament for the Confirmation of it.

This is farther clear from the Parliament's referring in the Act to the *Records* which ſhew our Biſhops to have been conſecrated according to the Laws. For can our Adverſaries have the face to tell us, that by theſe Records they mean ſome publick Acts, that give an Account of the *Nag's-Head* Ordination? Are there any ſuch Acts to be ſeen or heard of? And does it not appear that the Parliament mean only ſuch Acts wherein the Biſhops are related to be conſecrated by King *Edward*'s Form? Will they tell us there were no ſuch Acts that were true and genuine? Then they muſt be ſuch as *Parker* and his Brethren had forged,

forged, to repreſent themſelves as lawfully conſecrated according to the Queen's Mandates, and by producing ſuch Acts of their Conſecrations had the good Fortune to impoſe upon the eaſy Queen, and the credulous Lords and Commons in that Parliament. Here again the Hiſtory is wanting to itſelf, and we ought to have been told, that our Prelates compleated their Villany, and got themſelves fully eſtabliſhed, by this Forgery. This would have ſaved the Writers the Trouble of making the Acts of the Conſecrations of *Parker*, *&c.* forged no ſooner than about the time when Mr. *Maſon* firſt made uſe of them, forty Years after the time when there was the greateſt Occaſion for them, to give Satisfaction to the Queen and the Nation. The Author of the *Treatiſe of Catholick Faith and Hereſy*, tells us [w], *ſuppoſing there were ſuch Records of* Parker's *Conſecration extant in the eighth Year of Queen* Elizabeth, *they might as well be forged in Queen* Elizabeth's *as in King* James's *Reign.* He is indifferent as to the Time, provided they be looked upon as forged; but if they were forged, it ought in Reaſon to have been done ſo much earlier as before the Parliament 8 *Eliz.* to make that Parliament believe, that *Parker* and the others were conſecrated according to the Laws, and by the Form in King *Edward*'s Ordinal. The Author is poſitive that they were *either not extant then, or were forged*, becauſe *they were not produced to the Catholick Doctors* of that time. They were not produced to thoſe Doctors, becauſe they never aſked for them, nor ever called in queſtion the Fact of the Ordinations of our Biſhops, as will be abundantly proved: But they muſt have been produced to the Parliament, or known to them before, or conſulted by them upon that Occaſion, otherwiſe

[w] P. 16.

they

they could not declare the Conſecrations to be good and lawful upon the Faith of the Records. He ſays they were not produced, becauſe *many were then living who could have proved them to be forged*; and yet the time when that Parliament referr'd to them muſt be when moſt of the Perſons were living who were in being at the time of the Conſecrations, and ſome of them ſuch Perſons, who both in Principle and Intereſt muſt be diſpoſed to oppoſe the Bill to confirm thoſe who came into the Places of the Popiſh Deprived Prelates, and would no queſtion, if it had been in their Power, have prevented that Bill's paſſing into an Act, by proving that the Records were forged which were the Ground of declaring the Lawfulneſs of the Conſecrations. But, whatever were the Debates in both Houſes, and the Number of thoſe who gave their Votes againſt the paſſing of the Bill, as it appears by the Journals ſome did, (and they might upon their Principles have Reaſon to refuſe to join in an Act to confirm ſuch Conſecrations as *good and lawful, and perfect*, which wanted the Pope's Authority, and the Uſe of the *Roman* Pontifical) this is certain, that the Act declaring the Biſhops to have been conſecrated by King *Edward*'s Form, and appealing to the Records for the Truth of that Declaration, was paſſed by the Conſent of the Majority of the Peers and Commons, and had the Queen's Royal Aſſent: And it muſt be incumbent upon our Adverſaries to prove that thoſe Records were not then extant; or that they were forged at that time, and that, tho' the Forgery of them was proved before the Two Houſes, yet the Queen and the Eſtates of the Realm were prevailed upon to make themſelves Parties to it, and to confirm the Conſecrations of our Biſhops upon the Authority of theſe forged Records.

14. And

14. And nothing, it appears, is too hard for a ſkilful and zealous Advocate for the Tavern Story. *Le Quien*'s great Knowledge of Perſons and Facts in our Hiſtory enables him to make ſuch a ſurprizing Diſcovery, and to let us into the Secret, how the Parliament 8 *Eliz.* were wrought upon and brought to declare the *Nag's-Head* Biſhops to be duly and orderly conſecrated. It was effected, as he repreſents it, by a Maſter-piece of Prieſtcraft in the Head of the Order, Arch-Biſhop *Parker*. The *Father* is upon other Occaſions very free with the Character of that Prelate; whom he makes a [x] *Zuinglian* and *Calviniſt*, and, to be conſiſtent with himſelf, an *Eraſtian* too, (of a Principle quite oppoſite to *Calvin*) to give a Colour to his Account, of his taking Poſſeſſion of the Arch-Biſhoprick, *without Solemnity, without Ceremony, by vertue only of the Queen's Letters Patents*, upon a Belief of her *having Authority to make Biſhops without the Neceſſity of any Ordination*. And he repreſents him as having ſo little Value for a Conſecration by King *Edward*'s Form, that [y] *upon the Review of the Common Prayer Book in the Beginning of the Queen's Reign, he laid aſide the reviewing of that King's Ordinal* annext to it; *looking upon it*, as *Le Quien* tells us, *as an uſeleſs Book*: quite contrary to what appears from an *Authentick Paper* above cited, wherein the Arch-Biſhop tells Secretary *Cecil* [z], That *the Order of King* Edward's *Book was to be obſerved in his Conſecration*. But the Repreſentation of *Parker*'s Conduct in this Parliament is the moſt extraordinary; and muſt be either very little for the Arch-Biſhop's, or not much to the *Father*'s Reputation. *The Declaration* [a], he ſays, in the

LeQuien's *falſe and ſcandalous Account of Arch-Biſhop* Parker's *Conduct in the Parliament* 8 Eliz.

[x] T. 1. p. 269. Addit. p. 111.
[y] T. 1. Addit. p. iv.
[z] Sup. p. 142.
[a] T. 1. p. 428.

Act

Act 8 *Eliz. diſcovers itſelf to be the Work of* Parker, *by the general and ambiguous Expreſſions* wherein the Senſe of it is *wrapped up:* and that we may more eaſily believe it to come from that Hand, he tells us in the next Page [b], That *Cranmer* under King *Edw.* VI. and *Parker* under Queen *Elizabeth*, were *Maſters of the framing and drawing up of the Acts of Parliament relating to Religion as they pleaſed*, and *in ſuch a manner as might be moſt proper to impoſe upon and miſlead the Nation.* His Account of the Arch-Biſhop's Subtlety and Artifice, in the drawing up of the Declaration in this Act, is grounded upon an uncommon Piece of *Engliſh* Hiſtory, [c] "That none of Queen *Elizabeth*'s Biſhops were conſecrated by King *Edward*'s Form, till five or ſix Years after *Parker*, *Grindall*, and others (whom ſhe nominated ſoon after her Acceſſion to the Throne) had been inveſted in their Sees; at the time when the Convocation, *Ann.* 1562. had reviſed and corrected King *Edward*'s Ordinal, and made a Rule for that Form to be obſerved from that time in the Conſecration of our Biſhops and Clergy, tho' it had not been uſed in the Conſecrations of her Biſhops before." Upon this Ground *Le Quien* has the Confidence to affirm, that *Parker* drew up the Declaration in the Statute 8 *Eliz.* with a Deſign to make the World believe, tho' he was conſcious of the contrary, that himſelf and *Grindall*, *&c.* were, as well as thoſe later Biſhops (conſecrated after the Convocation of 1562.) ordained by King *Edward*'s Form. The Declaration, as he cites it, ſets forth. [d] *That the Queen, ſince the Beginning of her Reign, had cauſed divers learned Men to be elected, made, and conſecrated Arch-Biſhops and Biſhops ac-*

[b] Ibid. p. 429.
[c] T. 1. p. 268, 318. Add. p. 11.
[d] T. 1. p. 426.

cording

cording to King Edward's *Form authorized by Parliament:* And afterwards declares, [e] *That* thoſe *Perſons* (*all Perſons*, he ſhould have ſaid) *who have been or ſhall be conſecrated Arch-Biſhops or Biſhops by that Form, are and ſhall be Arch-Biſhops and Biſhops*—— *any Statute*, &c. *to the contrary notwithſtanding.* But *it does not*, he ſays, declare, [f] That *ſuch and ſuch* Perſons (he means *Parker*, and *Grindal*, &c. or any other Perſons by Name) *had been truly ordained and conſecrated according to that Form, and conſequently are truly Arch-Biſhops and Biſhops*; but, by thoſe indefinite and ambiguous Expreſſions (of *divers* Perſons, and *thoſe* Perſons) [g] *makes no Diſtinction between the pretended Conſecrations of* Parker, Grindal, Horne, Jewel, *and* Sands, *and thoſe of the Biſhops who were conſecrated after the Convocation*, Ann. 1562. *It was*, he affirms [h], Parker's *Intereſt that the World ſhould believe that his Conſecration, as well as that of the later Biſhops, was reputed to have been lawfully done, at leaſt according to King* Edward's *Form*; and for this purpoſe, he had *made uſe of his Credit to prevent the Court of King's Bench from giving Judgment in the Suit between* Bonner *and* Horne; *and was without queſtion of the Committee by whom that Affair was again had under Examination*; *and in Concert with his Friend Secretary* Cecil, *drew up the Declaration in ſuch manner, as that it might be effectual to make all of them be equally acknowledged for true Biſhops.*

Here we have *Le Quien*'s Information, and if we give Credit to it we are to believe, That *Parker* was convicted in his Conſcience, that neither himſelf nor any other of the Biſhops before the Convocation 1562. were conſecrated by King *Edward's* Ordinal: That all the Truth in the Declaration of the Parliament 8 *Eliz.* was that the

[e] Ibid. 427. [f] Ibid. [g] P. 426. [h] P. 428.

Queen, after the Year 1562, and not before, cauſed *divers* Perſons to be conſecrated Arch-Biſhops and Biſhops, according to King *Edward*'s Form; and that thoſe Perſons only could be looked upon to be declared by the Parliament Arch-Biſhops and Biſhops: But that the Declaration was ſo worded by the crafty Arch-Biſhop, to cover his own want of any lawful Ordination, as to make it appear to be the Senſe of that Parliament, that himſelf and all the Biſhops that had been made ſince the Beginning of the Queen's Reign, were thoſe *divers* Perſons conſecrated by that Form, and adjudged thereupon to be true and lawful Biſhops. He adds, that with the like Art he had impoſed upon the Judges of the *King's-Bench*, who (he means) would otherwiſe have given Sentence that *Horne* had no Conſecration by King *Edward*'s Form, and that therefore *Bonner*'s Plea was good, that he was *No Biſhop*. But ſhould not *Le Quien* have had a better Foundation of Truth, to ſupport this Account of *Parker*'s Conduct, which, if it be groundleſs, muſt be looked upon not only as a bold Fiction of his, but as an unjuſt and baſe Scandal caſt upon the Memory of that Arch-Biſhop? It is very eaſy to be ſatisfied what Truth there is in that which he gives us for certain Fact, That the Queen's Biſhops were none of them conſecrated by King *Edward*'s Form till after that Convocation. There needs no more but to ſee who were the Biſhops that ſat and paſſed the XXXIX Articles in that Convocation. There ſat [i] *Jan.* 13. $156\frac{2}{3}$. beſides the Metropolitan *Parker*, eighteen Biſhops of the Province of *Canterbury*; and [k] the Subſcribers to the Articles *Jan.* 29. were *Parker* and *Young*, the two Arch-Biſhops of *Canterbury*

[i] Strype's Life of Matth. Parker, p. 121.
[k] Id. Annals of Reformation, p. 289.

and

and *York*, and eighteen of their Suffragans: Beſides that we have an Account of two more, whoſe Names are entered in ſome Extracts from the Regiſters of Convocations, as having ſubſcribed to the ſame Articles. If to theſe we add the Biſhops of *Landaff* and *Carliſle*, it appears that all the Epiſcopal Sees in *England* and *Wales* were filled at that time with Biſhops, except *Briſtol*, which the Biſhop of *Gloceſter* was allowed to hold *in Commendam*, and *Oxford*, which was ſtill kept vacant. The like Evidence we have if we enquire what was the Number of Lords Spiritual in the Parliament that began upon the ſame Day with the Convocation; where we find no fewer than [l] *twenty two Biſhops* (all, as Mr. *Strype* ſays, except the Biſhops of *Landaff* and *Carliſle*) attending upon the Queen in the Proceſſion for the opening of that Parliament. And I need not farther refer the Reader to the *Table* in the ſame [m] *Author*, which ſhews that in *April* 1562, eight Months before the Convocation at the end of that Year, the whole Number of Sees were filled, excepting the two mentioned before. If this Account of the Number of our Prelates, at and before that Convocation, be to be credited, *Le Quien* muſt either have a Knowledge of our Affairs, communicated to none but himſelf, or elſe he muſt expect that his own Dreams and Fancies muſt paſs with us for true Matter of Fact; and that we ſhould take it upon his Word, that the whole Upper Houſe in the Synod of 1562, and the Biſhops Bench in that Parliament, were filled with none but *Parker* and *Grindall*, and three or four more, of the Queen's firſt Nomination; after whoſe Inſtalment in their Sees, we are to believe that there were no other Biſhops made till

[l] Strype's Annals of the Reformation, p. 255.
[m] Id. p. 157.

that Synod had ordered that King *Edward*'s Form ſhould be uſed in their Conſecrations. The like Agreement there is between his Account and the Truth of our Hiſtory, in the Number of Biſhops which, by his Reckoning, muſt have been made and conſecrated in the Interval between the Convocation 1562, and the Parliament 1566; *viz.* as many as, together with *Parker* and his Set of Biſhops, to fill the reſt of the Sees, except thoſe of *Briſtol* and *Oxford*; inſtead of which Number, we find no more than one ſingle Biſhop made during that time, [n] *Robinſon* of *Bangor*, who ſucceeded *Meyrick* in that See, and was conſecrated *October* 20. 1566. Beſides that, by the *Father*'s Account, ſome Arch-Biſhops muſt have been made in that time, and yet we find from *February* 156$\frac{0}{1}$, when *Young* was tranſlated from St. *David*'s to *York*, no other Arch-Biſhops but *Parker* and him, to the end of their Lives. Thus we ſee what Credit is to be given to *Le Quien*'s Story, and the ſcandalous Report of Arch-Biſhop *Parker*, which has no other Foundation. The Fiction might have been more eaſily and probably improved into another Calumny, equally injurious to *Parker*'s Memory, and equally credible. Whatever hand that Prelate had in drawing up the Act of Parliament 8 *Eliz.* he had no queſtion a great hand in the framing and wording of the thirty nine Articles of Religion paſſed in the Convocation of 1562. In the thirty ſixth of thoſe Articles, he and his Brethren *decree* that all Perſons, who had been conſecrated by King *Edward*'s Form *ſince the ſecond Year of that King unto the time* of that Convocation, *are rightly, orderly, and lawfully conſecrated.* This muſt appear very ſtrange in him and the reſt of the Biſhops that

[n] Le Neve's Faſti Eccleſ. Angl. p. 27. Strype's Life of M. Parker, p. 203, 204, 234.

ſat

ſat with him, to any one that believes that they were conſcious to themſelves, that not one of their whole Number ever had that Conſecration; but *Le Quien* would have had the Sagacity to diſcover the Trick in it, that this was another Inſtance of the Arch-Biſhop's Diſſimulation and Hypocriſy, in drawing up that Article in ſuch terms, as by this Contrivance to make the Nation and the Chriſtian World believe, that he himſelf and all the Biſhops in that *Synod*, as well as thoſe of King *Edward*'s time, were conſecrated in no other manner than by the Form in King *Edward*'s Ordinal.

But the *Father* has ſomething more, to ſatisfy us of the Truth of his Account of the Declaration in the Act of 8 *Eliz.* becauſe (as [o] he tells us) *the very next Year after the Parliament made that Declaration*, Stapleton, Harding, Briſtow, *and* Sanders, *and all the Catholicks, continued always, notwithſtanding that Declaration, to maintain boldly that* Parker *and his Brethren never received any Impoſition of Hands, not ſo much as according to King* Edward's *Form. Sanders* printed his *Rock of the Church, Ann.* 1567. the Year after this Parliament; but neither *Le Quien* nor any body elſe can pretend to ſhew us that he there maintains any ſuch thing, except it be implied in his confidently treating Dr. *Parker* (as he thinks fit to call him) as having no more than *the Name of Arch-Biſhop.* And for what he ſays many Years after, in his *Hiſtory of the* Engliſh *Schiſm*, it has been ſufficiently ſhewed [p] already, that nothing there can be made a Proof of his declaring that our firſt Biſhops were either ordained at the *Nag's-Head*, or not conſecrated at *Lambeth* by the Form in King *Edward*'s Ordinal. In the ſame Year (1567) *Stapleton* printed his *Counter-blaſt to* Horne,

[o] T. 1. p. 427, 428. [p] Sup. p. 28, 54.

but in the very *Preface* to it (to *Le Quien*'s great Surprize, who had over-looked the *Preface* [q], till he came to the End of the firſt Tome of his own Work) that Author owns expreſly that *the Queen's Biſhops were ordained by the Form eſtabliſhed by King* Edward. But the *Father* was pleaſed to find himſelf provided of an *Invention* [r], to elude the Force of that Author's expreſs Words, by applying to the Solution of that Difficulty, the ſame Story which had been the Ground of the Slander he had publiſhed of Arch-Biſhop *Parker*, and bearing us down, that the Author ſpeaks there of no other Biſhops, but ſuch as were not conſecrated till after the Year 1562. (tho' it appears his Number could be no more than two, [s] *Robinſon* of *Bangor*, *Ann.* 1566. and [t] *Jones* of *Landaff*, *Ann.* 1567.) and never had it in his Thoughts to own that *Parker*, *Grindall*, and *Horne*, and others of the firſt Set of Biſhops before the Conſecration 1562. were conſecrated by that Form. There will be an Occaſion afterwards to ſhew very clearly the Abſurdity of this *Evaſion*, when we come to conſider that Paſſage in *Stapleton*; but this muſt be left to the following Chapters, as well as to make it appear (upon a full View of what *Le Quien*, and his Follower the *Remarker*, ſay to the contrary) that neither the Writers nor the Popiſh Biſhops of that time deny the Conſecration of *Parker*, *&c.* at *Lambeth*, by King *Edward*'s Ordinal, or had any Thought of declaring that thoſe Biſhops were ordained at the *Nag's-Head* Tavern.

[q] T. 1. Add. p. i. [r] Ibid. p. ii. [s] Sup. p. 176.
[t] Le Neve's Faſti, p. 522.

CHAP.

CHAP. VI.

None of the Popiſh Biſhops or Divines of that time ever heard of ſuch a Fact as the Tavern-Conſecration. The Letters of ſome of thoſe Biſhops to the Queen and the Arch-Biſhop, at that time, prove they were ignorant of it. Bonner's *not having any ſuch Information proved from his* Defence *of his Plea againſt* Horne *under his Hand. The true Ground of his Plea ſhewed to be contradictory to the* Nag's-Head *Story. Confutation of what* Le Quien *and the* Remarker *pretend to the contrary.* Bonner's *ſaying that* Horne *had not* four Biſhops *at his Conſecration no Proof of his Denial that he was conſecrated by the four Perſons named in the Regiſter. What moſt probably* Bonner *meant by that Expreſſion. Sum of the Arguments to prove* Bonner's *being unacquainted with this Pretended Fact. Confutation of the* Remarker's *Anſwer to the Argument from the Ground of* Bonner's *Plea.* Bonner's *Conduct while his Cauſe lay before the King's Bench, and when it was brought before the Parliament, proves that he had no Thoughts of objecting to* Horne, *that he was ordained at the Tavern.* Le Quien's *romantick Account of the Caſe between* Bonner *and* Horne. *His Attempt to prove that* Bonner *denied the Fact of* Horne's *Ordination from what he makes (according to the Author of* Eraſtus Sen.) *to be the Office of our* Engliſh *Juries. Confutation of the*

Remarker's *Pretence that* Horne *declined bringing the Cauſe to a Trial, for fear it ſhould be proved upon him that he was ordained at the* Nag's-Head. *Farther Obſervations from a* MS. *in the* Cotton *Library.*

None of the Popiſh Biſhops or Divines of that time ever heard of ſuch a Fact as the Tavern-Conſecration.

1. THE *Nag's-Head* Ordination is not more effectually diſproved by the Inconſiſtencies, Contradictions, and Abſurdities in the Relation of the Story in the ſeveral Writers, than it is from the Silence of thoſe that lived at the very time, and could not fail of having an Account of it preſently, nor of charging it home upon the newly-ordained Biſhops. I mean the *Catholick Biſhops and Doctors of Queen* Mary's *time*, (whom the Writer of the *Nullity* [a] ſpeaks of) then newly deprived of their Stations and Preferments in the Church, and therefore ſo much the more forward, if there had been any ſuch Story, *to believe it and recount it to others* [b], as he ſays they did to *Holywood*, *Champney*, and *Fitz-Simon*, &c. *who publiſhed it in Print*; or rather to publiſh it themſelves immediately, as ſoon as the Fact was done, and not leave it to be put in Print forty Years after. I have had Occaſion already to ſhew how little it was known to one [c], whom *Fitz-Simon* and others are willing to put at the Head of the *Nag's-Head Writers*, the Hiſtorian of the *Engliſh Schiſm*, *Nicholas Sanders*; whoſe not publiſhing it to the World, is a Demonſtration that no ſuch Fact, after all his Care and Diligence to inform himſelf, ever came to his Knowledge, for him to offer to give it a Place in his Hiſtory. And there is the like Evidence that it was unknown to *Bonner*, *Heath*, and the reſt of their Biſhops; and to *Harding*, and *Stapleton*, and

[a] Sup. p. 115. [b] Ibid. [c] Sup. p. 54, &c.

their other Controverſial Writers, who were ſoon after engaged againſt our Proteſtant Divines in the Diſputes about Religion. *Bonner* was one that muſt have had the firſt Notice of it, and had a very particular Occaſion, five or ſix Years after, to publiſh his Knowledge of the Fact in his own Defence. But both he and the reſt of the Biſhops did not want a more early Opportunity of diſcovering it, as ſoon as they are pretended to come to hear of it, to the Confuſion of the Anti-Biſhops, and the Shame of any that pretended to countenance or protect them. Mr. *Strype* produces a Letter [d] of that Biſhop, and *Heath*, and ſome others, ſubſcribed with their Names, and ſent to the Queen, dated *December* 4. 1559. two Days before her ſecond Mandate was iſſued for the Confirmation and Conſecration of Arch-Biſhop *Parker*, but almoſt three Months after the Pretended Ordination of him and his Brethren at the Tavern. They could not but have had time enough, if there had been any ſuch Fact, to be apprized of it; and could they then have forborne, upon this Occaſion, to let her Majeſty underſtand that the Prelate whom ſhe was then promoting to the Arch-Biſhoprick in the legal Courſe, had ſome Months ſince, without any regard to the Pope's or to her Authority, or to the Laws in the Church or State, placed himſelf of his own Head in the *Metropolitical* Chair, and had, together with ſome others whom ſhe had nominated to the vacant Sees, procured himſelf and them to be ordained Biſhops in a very ſcandalous Place and Manner? Muſt they not hope, that this Information would have provoked the Queen to an utter Abhorrence of him and the reſt of thoſe *Hedge Prieſts*, (a Name which would have

The Letters of ſome of thoſe Biſhops, to the Queen and the Arch-Biſhop, ſhew they were ignorant of it.

[d] Annals of Reform. under Q. Eliz. Part 1. p. 147. from Sir Hen. Sydn. Memor.

been

been proper for them, and which *Parſons* [e] impudently tells us ſhe gave to Arch-Biſhop *Whitgift*, and others of the Prelates who came to do the laſt Offices to her upon her Death-bed) and have brought her to a Reſolution of reſtoring to their Sees her *Siſter*'s Biſhops lately deprived, rather than to ſet up ſuch a baſe and contemptible Sort of Hierarchy? But, inſtead of giving her this Account, all the Effect of their Addreſs to her, is only in general to call her back from *Schiſms and Hereſies to the Ancient Catholick Faith*, and to lay before her her Duty to be ſubject to *the Supremacy of the Church of* Rome. If we ſuppoſe that they were under ſome degree of Awe that reſtrained them in their Approaches to the Queen's Majeſty; they had Reaſon at leaſt to be more free with *Parker* himſelf, to whom, as the ſame Writer [f] informs us, they writ a Letter ſoon after, *loading him, and the Biſhops and Clergy then placed in the Church, with Curſes and Threatnings, for not acknowledging the Papacy.* The Contents of their Letter we may learn (tho' the Letter itſelf is not extant) by another from the Arch-Biſhop to them, dated *March* 26. 1560. where he gives an Anſwer to the Particulars of it in order; and by that Anſwer nothing more appears to have been objected by them, but that our Prelates were Proteſtants, and refuſed to be in Subjection to the Authority of the Biſhop of *Rome*. Had they not here a fair Opportunity to take ſome Notice, how theſe Men, who rejected the Supreme Paſtor of Chriſt's Church, had taken upon them to make themſelves Biſhops and Paſtors, in ſuch a Way that the hearing of it muſt fill the whole Chriſtian World with Horror and Aſtoniſhment? Could they be ignorant of ſuch a

[e] Diſcuſſion, p. 219. Fitz-Simon in Britannomachiâ p. 318.
[f] Life of Matth. Parker, p. 67.

Fact,

Fact, done almoſt three Months before, at which the *Chaplain* of one of them, ſent by his Lord to the Place, for that as well as other Purpoſes, was preſent, and ſaw and heard every thing that was ſaid or done, and was to report it to his Lord as ſoon as he returned from the Place? If, ſuppoſing it to be done, it was not poſſible that they ſhould be ignorant of it, does not their not ſpeaking a Word that might look that way ſhew there was no ſuch Fact, nor any ſuch Perſon as is pretended preſent at the doing of it, to be an Evidence of it to them?

Bonner's not having Information of it proved from his Defence of his Plea againſt Horne.

2. But *Bonner*, as I ſaid before, had within a very few Years a particular and more preſſing Occaſion to give an Account of this ſcandalous Proceeding; when he came to be engaged in a Conteſt with *Horne* Biſhop of *Wincheſter*, before the Court of King's Bench in *Weſtminſter-Hall*. We have in the *Reports* [g] of the Lord Chief Juſtice *Dyer*, the Exceptions he put in by his Council to the Indictment brought againſt him for refuſing to take the Oath of Supremacy, tendered to him by Biſhop *Horne*, upon the Statute 5 *Eliz.* empowering the Biſhops to tender the Oath to any Eccleſiaſtical Perſons within their Dioceſſes. The chief of thoſe Exceptions was, That *Horne* was *No Biſhop*; and this the Judges, after much Debate, agreed ſhould be tried by a Jury. As it never came to a Trial, we can have no farther Light from the *Reports*, upon what Grounds this Exception was made; but all we have is from ſome *Draughts* in *Bonner*'s own Hand, among Mr. *Fox*'s MSS. printed from thence by Mr. *Strype*; and from another MS. in the *Cotton* Library, part of which is produced by the ſame Author. In *Bonner*'s *Draughts* of what he ap-

[g] Term. Mich. A. 6 & 7 Eliz.

pears

pears to have thought proper to be alledged by himſelf or his Council, he ſays in Relation to *Horne*'s Perſon and his Title, "[h] That he was "not lawful Biſhop of *Wincheſter*, but an In- "truder and Uſurper and unlawful Poſſeſſioner, "as not elected, conſecrated, or provided ac- "cording to the Laws of the Catholick Church, "and the Statutes and Ordinances of the Realm, "nor eligible to that Dignity according to the "Canons of the Catholick Church, being a Per- "ſon infamed, unworthy, and utterly unmeet "for the ſame." And again, "[i] That he was "no lawful Biſhop— for many Cauſes, and eſpe- "cially for that he was not lawfully conſecrated "according to the Statutes of this Realm, eſpe- "cially *Stat.* 25 *H.* VIII. *ch.* 20. which required "one Arch-Biſhop and two Biſhops, or elſe four "Biſhops, at his Conſecration; which he had "not." And again, "[k] That he ought to be "excluded and rejected from the Biſhoprick of "*Wincheſter*, as an Intruder, Uſurper, and un- "lawful Poſſeſſioner, eſpecially being a notori- "ous Lecher and Adulterer, Heretick, and "Schiſmatick, and in no wiſe a lawful Biſhop." Theſe are what Objections he has againſt *Horne*, to make good his Plea of his being *No Biſhop*; and can any one that reads this conceive that *Bonner* had known very well for five or ſix Years, that his Adverſary, together with *Parker* and others of our Biſhops, was conſecrated at the *Nag's-Head* Tavern, and yet that ſcandalous and profane Conſecration ſhould have no Place among the Heads of Objections againſt *Horne*? He allows himſelf, it appears, to load that Prelate with Calumnies, which he knew he ſhould not be called upon to prove, being quite foreign to the Plea which he

[h] Strype's Annals of Q. Eliz. T. 1. p. 341. [i] Ibid. p. 342.
[k] Ibid. p. 343.

had

had put into the Court againſt him; as his being an *infamous and unworthy Perſon, a notorious Lecher, Adulterer, Heretick and Schiſmatick*; all which, tho' it had been real Truth and not only a malicious vile Scandal, could not have proved *Horne* to be *No Biſhop*, if he had been truly and legally elected, confirmed, and conſecrated: But he has not a Word of that Charge, which alone would have been effectual to have juſtified his own Plea, and to have blackned his Adverſary as much as any other Crime the Guilt of which he charges him with; his taking upon him the higheſt Order in the Church in ſuch a profane and ſacrilegious Manner. But inſtead of laying open the Hiſtory of his Ordination at the Tavern, the Reſult of what he ſets down to be alledged in proof that he was *No Biſhop*, is that he was not *lawfully* made, in particular *that he was not conſecrated according to the Statute* 25 Hen. VIII, *which required that he that is to be conſecrated muſt among other things have one Arch-Biſhop and two Biſhops, or elſe four Biſhops, at his Conſecration*; *which the ſaid Dr.* Horne *had not.* Setting aſide his Miſtake in the Words of that Statute, (which does not require four Biſhops to conſecrate any one under the Degree of an Arch-Biſhop) what could have been more natural for him than to have concluded thus upon this Head? "Which the ſaid Dr. *Horne* "had not, but only one *Scory* an Apoſtate Prieſt "for his Conſecrator, who ordained him not in "any ſacred Place but in a Tavern, without any "of the Ceremonies preſcribed to be obſerved in "the Conſecration of a Biſhop, either by the "*Roman* Pontifical, or King *Edward*'s Ordinal, "and without any religious Solemnity at all." This would have been directly to his Purpoſe, and the Account of ſuch a ſcandalous Proceeding ought to have filled (*utramque paginam*) the whole almoſt of what he lays down in theſe Papers.

Every

Every thing elſe that we meet with in them is as impertinent, and as far from the Merits of the Cauſe, as the railing Accuſation againſt his Adverſary ſet down already. For inſtance, [l] His demanding Juſtice of the Court againſt that Biſhop for bringing him in Peril of his Life, by making him run the Gantlet thro' the Rabble from the *Marſhalſea* to the Biſhop's Palace, and back again; a good Proof (not that the Biſhop, as he ſays, had ſet them upon him, but) that he was ſo odious for his former barbarous Cruelties that his Priſon was his only Sanctuary: [m] His Vanity in ſaying Biſhop *Horne* and his Secretary knew not how to draw up the Act without his teaching them: [n] His fruitleſs Attempt to prove, in a great many Words, that the Oath of Supremacy was not lawful for him to take. And, [o] That which was as audacious as weak, his declaring that the *Statutes* 1 and 5 *Eliz.* by vertue of which the Oath of Supremacy had been enacted, and was twice tendered to him, *had no Strength, Force, or Power, for want of the Conſent of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and Commons in Parliament aſſembled.* What does he mean? Were not theſe Statutes paſſed in full Parliament by the Majority of the Two Houſes, and then had the Royal Aſſent? Yes, but he means, they wanted the Conſent of the Lords Spiritual, that is, of himſelf and the other Popiſh Prelates, who diſſented when the Bill paſſed in the former, and were deprived ſome Years before the latter Parliament. Could ſuch trifling have been of any Service to him in his Cauſe? Would his Council have offered to plead before the Judges, upon theſe Reaſons, that thoſe Acts of Parliament had no Authority? Or could they have been ſo ridiculous as to argue

[l] Ibid. p. 242. [m] Ibid. p. 343. [n] Ibid. p. 341, 342.
[o] Ibid. p. 341.

before

before the Court upon thoſe other frivolous Pretences? What then could be the Reaſon of ſuch Allegations taking up almoſt the whole of his *Defence*, if he knew he had that to offer which would have confounded both his Adverſary and the Council for him; and have obliged the Court to acquit *Bonner*, and to give Sentence that neither *Horne* nor any other of our firſt Reformed Prelates, were true Biſhops? If his *Defence* in theſe Papers was drawn up after his Plea was put in and received by the Court, could a Man ſo bold and inſolent, as *Bonner* was known to be, have been able to diſſemble the Advantage he had againſt his Adverſary? His Plea was that *Horne* was no Biſhop: The Court were ſo fair and impartial as to admit this Plea upon Iſſue, and to agree that it ſhould be try'd by a Jury. If *Bonner* knew and remembred that *Horne*, and *Parker*, and the reſt of our firſt Biſhops were ordain'd at the *Nag's-Head*, muſt he not look upon his Plea's being receiv'd by the Judges, as half the Victory already gain'd? muſt he not have ſeen that now he had it in his Power to ruin the newly ſettled Hierarchy of the Proteſtant Biſhops? that he only wanted the Trial to be brought on before a Jury, at which time neither the adverſe Council nor the Court could be able to withſtand the Evidence which he had to produce of this Fact, That neither *Horne*, nor any of the reſt, had any lawful Ordination, but that they were ordain'd in ſo ſcandalous a Place and ſo profane a manner? Could he then have forborne to make ſome Diſcovery of this Aſſurance of the Strength of his Cauſe in theſe Draughts of the Heads of his Defence? could his Modeſty and Prudence have laid ſuch a Reſtraint upon him, as not to ſay a Word *by whom*, and *where*, and *in what manner Horne* was conſecrated, but only that he had not an Arch-Biſhop, nor a legal Number of Biſhops, at his Conſecration?

The true Ground of Bonner's *Plea ſhewed to be contradictory to the* Nag's-Head *Story.*

But there is no need of inſiſting upon this Argument, from *Bonner*'s own Draughts of his Caſe, to prove that he had no thought of alledging the *Nag's-Head* Ordination, if it can otherwiſe be made appear, that he and his Council had quite different Grounds to offer in Proof of his Plea, and ſuch as his Council would never have made uſe of, if he could have inſtructed them to object and prove againſt *Horne* that he had his Ordination at that Tavern; then it will follow that this Caſe between him and that Biſhop proves that he was utterly ignorant of that Story. And this will appear from the MS. in the *Cotton* Library, part of which is produced by [p] Mr. *Strype*; and I ſhall my ſelf ſet down a *Tranſcript* from the MS. of as much as relates to this Subject. It is a Diſcourſe writ in Queen *Elizabeth*'s Reign, and deſigned for the Preſs, by one that was not diſpoſed to be partial in favour of the Biſhops, his Subject being to prove that they had no ſuch Juriſdiction by Law, as they pretended to exerciſe in their Courts. Upon [q] this Occaſion he finds it proper to ſhew, as of other Statutes, ſo of the *Stat.* 8 *Eliz.* that it gives the Biſhops no ſuch Juriſdiction; and his Reaſons are, firſt, That the Deſign of that Statute was only *to take away all Ambiguities and Queſtions* about the making of our Biſhops, and the Words of the Statute *can extend no farther than to take away all Doubts about their Elections, Confirmations, and Conſecrations.* Secondly, that the *Statute* itſelf proves *what was the Cauſe of making it, viz.* "Whereas the Book of "Common Prayer was only eſtabliſhed in the "firſt Year of her Majeſty's Reign, and not the "Book of King *Edward* for making of Mini-"ſters, and conſecrating of Biſhops, and yet ne-

[p] Life of Matth. Parker, p. 60. [q] Cotton Libr. Cleopatra F. i. fol. 45, 46. In Mr. Strype it is miſprinted F. 4.

"verthele[ſs]

" vertheleſs the Biſhops and Miniſters were made
" according to the ſaid Book, not yet authorized
" by Parliament; ſeeing the Stat. of 25 *H.* VIII.
" touching the making of Biſhops, was only re-
" vived *A.* 1*mo.* it was thought that the Conſe-
" cration of them ſhould have been made ac-
" cording to the Form uſed 25 *Hen.* VIII. and
" not according to the Book of King *Edward*,
" repealed in Queen *Mary*'s time.

" Wherefore (as he goes on in the next Words)
" it appeareth in L. *Dyer*'s Book, that at the
" Arraignment of *Bonner* he cavilled upon the
" Point, Whether *Horne* Biſhop of *Wincheſter*
" were a Biſhop or no. And it ſeemeth it was
" reſolved that if he would he ſhould be received
" upon that Iſſue, and the Jury ſhould try it.
" And *the Cauſe was nothing elſe* than that he was
" made Biſhop according to the Book of King
" *Edward*, not yet authorized in Parliament.
" Another Objection was againſt the Conſecration
" of *Parker* Arch-Biſhop of *Canterbury*, by whom
" the reſt were afterwards conſecrated and inveſt-
" ed. For whereas by Law three Biſhops at the
" leaſt ought to be at the conſecrating of an Arch-
" Biſhop, it was pretended that at his Conſecra-
" tion there was never a Biſhop at all. For *Bar-
" low*, *Scory*, *Coverdale*, and *Bale*, albeit in King
" *Edward*'s Days they were Biſhops, yet were
" they deprived in the time of Queen *Mary*,
" and not reſtored again. And the two Suffra-
" gans of *Bedford* and *Thetford* were in the ſaid
" time of Queen *Mary* depoſed by Act of Par-
" liament: ſo as it was ſuppoſed there was not one
" Biſhop at the ſaid Arch-Biſhop's Conſecration.

" Arch-Biſhop *Parker*, in the Deſcription of
" his own Life, ſeemeth to pretend that his Con-
" ſecration ſo paſſed *lege quâdam de hâc re latâ*;
" which cannot be underſtood of any other Act
" of Parliament than this: which indeed was

" very neceſſary both for the Confirmation of his
" own Conſecration and of all the Biſhops beſides;
" and likewiſe the ordering of all the Miniſters
" that were made from the Beginning of her Ma-
" jeſty's Reign, until the time of the making of
" the ſaid Statute.

" And ſo the Book of making of Miniſters and
" Biſhops being confirmed by Parliament, I do
" not deny but that the Elections, the Conſecra-
" tions and Inveſtments, are as lawful now as in
" the Days of King *Henry* VIII. and King *Ed-*
" *ward* VI. notwithſtanding any Variety betwixt
" the Letters Patents then and now. But it fol-
" loweth not that thereby any Juriſdiction is
" granted to them, *&c.*"

4. I lay ſo much of this Part of the Diſcourſe before the Reader, becauſe it will be of Uſe in ſeveral reſpects. And firſt it ſhews, what an impartial Writer of thoſe Times underſtood to be the Ground of *Bonner*'s and his Council's Plea againſt *Horne*, *viz.* That he was conſecrated only by the Form in King *Edward*'s Ordinal, which, tho' eſtabliſhed by that Prince, yet had been abrogated by Queen *Mary*, and was not reſtored by Queen *Elizabeth* at the time of *Horne*'s Conſecration; and conſequently he was not conſecrated according to Law. This he not only ſays was the Ground of *Bonner*'s Plea, but lays down firſt a Proof of it, that the ſame was the Cauſe of making the Act 8 *Eliz.* which he ſays appears from the Act itſelf. How it appears from that Statute he does not ſhew, but the Words of the Statute clearly prove it. It was made to put an End to the *Queſtions lately grown about the making and conſecrating our Arch-Biſhops and Biſhops*; which it does *by touching*, in the firſt place, *ſuch Authorities as allow and approve the making and conſecrating of them to be duly and orderly done.*

One of theſe *Authorities* is the Stat. 5 and 6 *Ed.* VI. and the Parliament 8 *Eliz.* ſay, that King *Edward* in that Statute did *add and put to the Book of Common Prayer, the Order and Form how our Biſhops and Miniſters ſhould be conſecrated*; that Queen *Mary repealed this Statute*, but it was *re-eſtabliſhed in the firſt Year of Queen* Elizabeth; and that the *Queen's Arch-Biſhops and Biſhops had been conſecrated according to the Order and Form* preſcribed by that Statute. What *Queſtion, about the making and conſecrating our Arch-Biſhops*, can we ſuppoſe the Parliament intended to put an End to by this Declaration? Can it be any other than this, Whether King *Edward*'s Form, by which they were conſecrated, was not deſtitute of legal Authority, being not reſtored by Act of Parliament 1 *Eliz.* after it had been repealed by Queen *Mary*; to determine which Queſtion the Parliament declares, That it was reſtored 1 *Eliz.* to its former Authority, and our Biſhops were conſecrated by it? So it appears from the Words of the Statute, that this Queſtion was the Occaſion of the making of it in that Parliament; and its being intended to take away ſuch *Queſtions*, as were *lately grown*, is (beſides its being confeſſed on all hands that the Suit between *Horne* and *Bonner* gave Occaſion to the bringing in this Bill in that Parliament) a good Reaſon for us to underſtand, that thoſe Queſtions aroſe lately from the *bold Speech and Talk* of the Party (as it is expreſſed in the Act) upon *Bonner*'s Counſel having put in, and the Judges of the *King's-Bench* not having rejected ſuch a Plea.

But if the Ground of that Plea be ſuch as this Writer relates, and the Stat. 8 *Eliz.* proves it was, and our Hiſtorians, *Heylin*, *Fuller*, *Burnet*, *Strype*, and *Collier*, as well as Biſhop *Bramhall* and other Controverſial Writers, affirm it to have been; it utterly deſtroys any Pretence of *Bonner*'s

or his Council's having it in their Thoughts to object the *Nag's-Head* Ordination againſt *Horne*. For their pleading that he was no Biſhop, upon this Reaſon, that he was conſecrated by King *Edward*'s *Ordinal*, not yet authorized by Parliament, implies an Acknowledgment that he was conſecrated by that Ordinal: Which neither *Bonner* nor his Council can be ſuppoſed to make, if he himſelf, and they from him, had been informed that *Horne* was ordained at the *Nag's-Head*. So that *Bonner*'s having had ſuch Information from the pretended Eye-witneſs his Chaplain *Neale*, and *Neale*'s having any ſuch Story to tell him, is plainly diſproved from this Plea, wherein he in effect diſclaims his having ever had any Knowledge of that Fact; and owns that the Matter of Fact in *Horne*'s Conſecration was the quite contrary, that is, that the Order and Form and all the Solemnities of Religion obſerved in it, were the ſame that King *Edward*'s Ordinal requires, and no other.

5. 'Tis true that in *Bonner*'s own Draughts we do not find this Objection relating to King *Edward*'s Ordinal, but only (as it appears before) [r] *Horne*'s not *having had an Arch-Biſhop and two Biſhops, or four Biſhops, at his Conſecration*; but from this nothing can be inferred, but that the Objection of *Horne*'s not having the legal Number of Conſecrators, was that which he himſelf thought might properly be alledged by his Council; but they, notwithſtanding, who were better Judges what might be of moſt Service to maintain his Plea, might reſolve to proceed upon another Ground, which they conceived would better bear the Weight of an Argument in point of Law. And that it was their Intention to proceed upon this Ground (of King *Edward*'s Ordinal) if the Cauſe

[r] Sup. p. 189.

had

had come to a Trial, appears from the Teſtimony of this Writer lying before us, and the others after him abovementioned, as well as from the Words of the Stat. 8 *Eliz.* as I have ſhewed.

6. *Le Quien* ſays [t] *he will not deny but* Bonner *might poſſibly alledge this Reaſon in his Defence*; and the *Remarker* grants that he *might inſiſt upon this as one Reaſon.* But then the former ſays that *Bonner alledged this only* par abondance de droit; that is, as ſomething which in Law he might plead over and above, beſides the other main Point: And the *Remarker* has the ſame Meaning, that [u] *it was only a ſubſidiary Point of Law.* Bonner's *Council*, he ſays [v], *caſt the Iſſue upon two Points of Law. One, that he had not been conſecrated by the Number of Biſhops appointed by Law; the other, that even ſuppoſing that Number had conſecrated him, either they did it according to the Pontifical, which was now illegal, or according to the New Ordinal, and that not being yet eſtabliſhed by Name, his Conſecration would ſtill be illegal.* Here, though he may think he ſtates this latter Point with great Niceneſs, yet he muſt give me leave to tell him, that he puts a very ſilly *Dilemma* into the Mouths of *Bonner*'s Council. If the *Roman* Pontifical was revived 1 *Eliz.* as preſcribed in the Stat. 25 *H.* VIII. and the Ordinal eſtabliſhed by King *Edward*'s Statute was not revived, it follows plainly that the Form in King *Edward*'s Ordinal was illegal, and the Old Form in the Pontifical was the only legal Form at that time; on the contrary, if King *Edward*'s Ordinal were revived, and the *Roman* Pontifical not revived, the Form in the Pontifical muſt be illegal, and that in the Ordinal the legal Form. How will he then make *Bonner*'s Council argue, that whether *Horne* was conſecrated by the Pontifical, or by the Ordinal,

Confutation of what Le Quien *and the* Remarker *pretend to the contrary.*

[t] T. 1. p. 253. [u] P. 298. [v] P. 291.

his Conſecration muſt be illegal? But this Acuteneſs is peculiar to the *Remarker:* What both *Le Quien* and he agree in is, that the main and principal Point of the Plea of *Bonner* and his Council was, That *Horne* had not the legal Number of Conſecrators; and that other, Of the Form whereby he might be conſecrated not being eſtabliſhed by Law, was only a ſecondary and ſubſidiary Point, *ex abundanti*, and upon a Suppoſition. The Reaſon why they are willing to make uſe of this Diſtinction is, becauſe if it be admitted that this latter was a direct and categorical Plea, it would imply *Bonner*'s and his Council's diſowning the *Nag's-Head* Ordination, and granting that the new Ordinal of King *Edward*, according to the Account in the *Lambeth* Regiſter, (and not *Scory*'s fantaſtical Form in the Tavern-Story) was actually uſed in *Horne*'s Conſecration. To avoid this, *Le Quien* invented, and the *Remarker* was glad to make uſe of this Hypotheſis, of *Bonner*'s having two Points to offer in defence of his Plea: The firſt and principal, That *Horne* was actually conſecrated at no other Place but the *Nag's-Head*, and had no other Form or Manner of Conſecration but that which *Scory* uſed at that Tavern: The ſecond and ſubſidiary Point, That upon Suppoſition that he was conſecrated at *Lambeth*, and by the Form in King *Edward*'s Ordinal, yet for want of that Ordinal's being re-eſtabliſhed by Law before his Conſecration, he could not be looked upon as legally conſecrated; and conſequently was no Biſhop.

But firſt, if *Bonner* had been informed of the *Nag's-Head* Ordination, and could have produced Evidence of the Fact, it is not poſſible to conceive that he or his Council would look for any other Plea, and not rather chuſe to abide by this, as ſure to carry the Cauſe for him; much leſs that they would ſecond it with ſuch a Plea, as muſt

firſt

firſt ſuppoſe the Fact alledged in his former Plea to be falſe and ſcandalous, and then could have no better Ground than a Cavil in point of Law, which he could not hope the Judges would not over-rule, if they ſhould deny to do him Juſtice in his firſt Plea, which was, in his Opinion, ſo clear and indiſputable. Secondly, the *Writer* from whom the Tranſcript above is taken, declares expreſly that Horne's *being made Biſhop by the Book of King* Edward *not yet authoriſed by Parliament, was the Cauſe, and* [w] nothing elſe, *of* Bonner's *Cavil, whether* Horne *were Biſhop or not.* And though in the very next Words he ſpeaks of *another Objection againſt the Conſecration of* Parker, that his Conſecrators had been deprived by Queen *Mary*, and not reſtored again by Queen *Elizabeth*; and ſhews it to be his own Opinion, that for this Reaſon *Parker*'s Conſecration, and the Ordinations of all others that derived their Orders from him, ſtood in need to be confirmed by Act of Parliament, till the Statute paſſed 8 *Eliz.* yet he does not mention this as a *Cauſe* why *Bonner* or his Council called in queſtion *Horne*'s Ordination, tho' *Horne* was one of thoſe who were *conſecrated and inveſted* by Parker. Thirdly, the reſt of our Writers, Arch-Biſhop *Bramhall* [x] in ſeveral Places of his Works, Dr. *Heylin* [y] in his Hiſtory of the Reformation, Biſhop *Burnet* [z] in his Expoſition of the thirty ſixth Article, and Mr. *Strype* [a], agree that the Ground of *Bonner*'s Plea was an Omiſſion in the Stat. 1 *Eliz.* which reſtored the Book of Common-Prayer, but did not diſtinctly and in expreſs Words reſtore the Form of Conſecration of Biſhops, *&c.* annexed to it; which Omiſſion gave our Adverſaries an Handle to pretend that the Form was not le-

[w] Sup. p. 193. [x] P. 254, 255, 452. [y] P. 346.
[z] P. 377. [a] Life of Matth. Parker, p. 60.

gally re-eſtabliſhed. And the Author of *Eraſtus Sen.* lays down this for the Ground of his Argument in the laſt Part of his Book to prove that *Parker* and *Horne*, *&c.* had no legal Conſecration. This is a ſufficient Diſproof of *Le Quien*'s and the *Remarker*'s Pretence, that *Horne*'s being ordained at the *Nag's-Head* was the *principal Point*, and that, ſuppoſing he was conſecrated by the Ordinal, yet that Form was not legally authorized, only a *ſubſidiary Point* of *Bonner*'s Plea: And the *Remarker*'s Confidence in calling it *manifeſt ſhuffling in F.* Le Courayer *and his Proteſtant Authors, to pretend that* Bonner's *Plea was chiefly on account of King* Edward's *Ordinal not being re-eſtabliſhed by Name*, may be juſtly return'd upon himſelf; as his and *Le Quien*'s Pretence to the contrary appears to be falſe and groundleſs, and nothing elſe but a ſhuffling Evaſion to ward off the Force of the Argument from *Bonner*'s Plea, that utterly ruins the Credit of the Tavern-Story.

Bonner's ſaying that Horne *had not* four Biſhops *for his Conſecrators, no Proof of his Denial that he was conſecrated by the four Perſons named in the Regiſter.*

7. But *Le Quien* is poſitive that *Bonner*'s alledging in his Draughts, that [b] Horne *had not an Arch-Biſhop and two Biſhops, or four Biſhops, at his Conſecration*, is a ſufficient Proof that it was the Meaning of his Plea to deny that *Horne* was conſecrated by *Arch-Biſhop* Parker, *and the Biſhops of* St. David's, London, Coventry *and* Litchfield, whom the Regiſter names for his Conſecrators; becauſe if it had been *true, and publickly known*, that *Horne* was conſecrated by theſe four Perſons, Bonner *and his Council muſt be void of Senſe and Reaſon in being ſo bold and raſh as to maintain openly, that* Horne *was not conſecrated by three* (he ſhould have ſaid *four*) *Biſhops*. The *Remarker* copies after *Le Quien*, and ſays [c], that *Bonner could not poſſibly inſiſt upon the Defect of the Number of Conſecrators, but in Suppoſition of* Horne's

[b] T. 1. p. 256, 257. [c] P. 298.

Conſecration being performed at the Nag's-Head, *or ſome ſuch Way.* He brings the ſame Reaſon as *Le Quien*, but is ſo wiſe as, by that which he adds to it in the Cloſe, to deſtroy the whole Force of it. His Words are [d], *According to the* Lambeth *Conſecration*, Horne *was conſecrated by* Parker, *aſſiſted by the Biſhops of* St. David's, London, *and* Coventry. *Conſequently* Bonner *and his Council (the three eminent Lawyers*, Plowden, Wray, *and* Lovelace) *muſt have been eminently mad, to inſiſt upon the Statute of* Hen. VIII. *if it was notorious that* Horne *was conſecrated by them, and* (as he adds in the Cloſe) *that they were legal Biſhops.* This Writer, it is plain, was not aware, nor perhaps underſtands at this time, that theſe Words, *and that they were legal Biſhops*, deſtroy the Force of *Le Quien's* whole Argument, as well as of the former Part of his own. But if he wants his Eyes to be opened, or the Matter to be ſet in a clearer Light, let him conſider what follows. *Bonner* and his Council, he ſays, muſt have been arrant Madmen to plead that *Horne* had not three or four Biſhops at his Conſecration, if it was *notorious that* Horne *was conſecrated by* Parker *and the Biſhops of* St. David's, London, *and* Coventry, *and that they were legal Biſhops.* He means they muſt have been able to have proved that theſe four Perſons did not conſecrate *Horne*, and that they were not legal Biſhops; or elſe in offering ſuch a Plea to the Court they would have deſerved to be ſent to *Bedlam.* But if they had been able to make Proof of the laſt Particular, that they were not legal Biſhops, the Neceſſity of their proving the firſt, that *Horne* was not conſecrated by them, would have been quite out of doors; for they might have allowed that theſe four Perſons conſecrated *Horne*, and have main-

[d] P. 291.

tained

tained notwithſtanding, that for want of theſe Perſons being legal Biſhops, *Horne* had not, as the Statute of *Hen.* VIII. required, three or four Biſhops, or one Biſhop, at his Conſecration, thoſe that conſecrated him being no Biſhops in the Eye of the Law. So *Le Quien*'s *Follower* may ſee, if he pleaſes, that by this Improvement (as he takes it to be) of *Le Quien*'s Reaſoning, he plainly deſtroys the Force of it. But to conſider it as it ſtands in *Le Quien* (without the *Remarker*'s Addition, wherein he *obligingly* (to uſe a Word of his own) confutes the *Father*'s and his own Argument) *Bonner* and his Council, as the *Father* argues, muſt have been void of Senſe and Reaſon, to plead that *Horne* had not three Biſhops at his Conſecration, if it had been certain and publick and notorious, that *Horne* was conſecrated by the Arch-Biſhop and the other Biſhops named in the Regiſter; conſequently they had no other way to make good their Plea but only by diſproving that Matter of Fact, and ſhewing that *Horne* was not conſecrated by Arch-Biſhop *Parker* and thoſe other Biſhops. But if they might have offered other Reaſons to prove their Plea, without denying but allowing the Matter of Fact to have been as it is related in our Regiſter, that *Horne* was actually conſecrated by the Perſons named there; then this Argument falls to the Ground. And here there needs no more than to put the Queſtion to *Le Quien* and the Author of the *Remarks*; If they had been of *Bonner*'s Council, do not they think they ſhould have been able to prove that *Parker*, *Young*, *Grindall*, and *Bentham* (who, if the Regiſter be true, were *Horne*'s Conſecrators) were not themſelves truly, or canonically, or legally conſecrated Biſhops; not truly, according to Chriſt's Inſtitution; nor canonically or legally, according to the Laws of the Church, and the Statutes of the Realm? If they could have proved

proved this, would it not have been a ſufficient Proof that thoſe four were no Biſhops; and conſequently that *Horne* had not an Arch-Biſhop or four Biſhops, nor ſo much as one Biſhop, at his Conſecration? Would they then have been under a Neceſſity of proving that thoſe four Perſons never laid their Hands upon *Horne*, or took upon them to be his Conſecrators? Or might they not have allowed and confeſſed that he did receive Impoſition of Hands from theſe four Perſons, only declaring that they were no Biſhops, and ſo he had not four Biſhops at his Conſecration? So it appears how good a Proof it is of *Le Quien*'s great *Senſe and Reaſon*, and of the *Remarker*'s being *eminently in his Wits*, that they tell us *Bonner*'s Council muſt have been *void of Senſe and Reaſon, and eminently mad*, to plead that *Horne* had not four Biſhops at his Conſecration, except they could have made it appear that he was not in fact conſecrated by *Parker*, *Young*, *Grindall*, and *Bentham*, the Biſhops of *Canterbury*, *St. David*'s, *London*, and *Litchfield and Coventry*, related to have been his Conſecrators in the *Lambeth* Regiſter.

This the Reader will obſerve to be, whether real or affected, the grand Miſtake that runs thro' the Way of arguing in theſe two Writers; That what is ſaid by *Bonner*, or *Harding*, or *Stapleton*, and either muſt or may be underſtood of the Point of Right, That they call in queſtion the Truth and Lawfulneſs of the Conſecrations of our firſt Biſhops by the Perſons and the Form related in the Regiſter; this *Le Quien* and the *Remarker* interpret of the Point of *Fact*, That *Bonner* and the others deny, that our Biſhops had Impoſition of Hands from thoſe Perſons, and by that Form; as will appear very fully afterwards, when we come to conſider what they alledge from *Stapleton* and *Harding*.

8. *Bonner*'s

What moſt probably Bonner *meant by* Horne's *not having the legal Number of Biſhops at his Conſecration.*

8. *Bonner*'s Council do not appear to have intended to alledge the Want of a legal Number of Conſecrators, tho' *Bonner* himſelf ſeems to make that the only Ground of his Plea, in the Draught of the Heads of his Defence under his hand: But granting that both he and his Council had that Intention, it is no Conſequence that they muſt have had this Meaning, that *Horne* was not conſecrated at *Lambeth* by the four Biſhops named in the Regiſter, but at the *Nag's-Head*, by *Scory* only; becauſe, as I have ſhewed, they might have offered ſeveral other Reaſons in Maintenance of that Plea, without denying that he was conſecrated by thoſe four Perſons. But it may, I believe, be made appear, that *Bonner* himſelf in that Allegation had a quite contrary Meaning, and never thought of objecting the *Nag's-Head* Conſecration to his Adverſary. It is plain from the *Diſcourſe* in the *Cotton Library* [e], that it was at that time a known and common Objection of our Popiſh Adverſaries againſt the Ordination of *Parker* and the other firſt Proteſtant Biſhops, That Parker, *by whom they were conſecrated and inveſted*, was himſelf conſecrated by *Barlow*, *Scory*, *Coverdale* and *Hodgskins*, which four (beſides *Bale* and the Suffragan of *Thetford*, who, tho' commiſſioned by the *Queen's Letters Patents*, did not join in the Conſecration) were not qualified to ordain him, having been deprived of their Biſhopricks by Queen *Mary*, and not reſtored by Queen *Elizabeth*; ſo that upon that Reaſon it was *pretended that* Parker *had never a Biſhop at all at his Conſecration*; that is, none at all that were legally qualified to act as Biſhops, being not in actual Poſſeſſion of Epiſcopal Sees. This pretended Defect in his Conſecration muſt extend itſelf alſo to the

[e] Sup. p. 193.

reſt

reſt of our Biſhops, who had their Conſecration from *Parker*, aſſiſted either by ſome of his own Conſecrators, or by ſome whom he had conſecrated; ſo that all our Biſhops before the Parliament 8 *Eliz.* ſuppoſing this Objection to be of any Weight, muſt be granted to have been no Biſhops in Law, till they were confirmed by that Parliament. The ſame Objection Sir *Edw. Coke*[f] ſays was made by *the Adverſaries againſt the Arch-Biſhops and Biſhops made about the Beginning of Queen* Elizabeth's *Reign*, and ſtates it much in the ſame manner with the former Writer: *That they were never conſecrated according to Law, becauſe they had not three Biſhops at leaſt, at their Conſecration; nay, never a Biſhop at all, as was pretended. Becauſe they* (that is, *Parker*'s Conſecrators) *being Biſhops in the Reign of King* Edward VI. *were deprived in the Reign of Queen* Mary, *and were not, as was pretended, reſtored before their Preſence at the Conſecration.* It is farther proved, that this was objected againſt our Biſhops by the Popiſh Party, at the time of the Parliament 8 *Eliz.* from the very Statute of that Parliament, *Declaring the Conſecrations of our Biſhops to be good, and lawful, and perfect*; which Statute refers to the Clauſe *Supplentes, &c.* in the Queen's Letters Patents for *Parker*'s *Conſecration*, to *diſpenſe with all Imperfections and Diſabilities*, in the Perſons of his Conſecrators; and this ſhews they intended to obviate a Pretence of ſome Diſability in thoſe Perſons.

Now this Objection plainly ſuppoſes, That *Parker*, by whom the reſt were conſecrated, was himſelf made Biſhop ſingly and alone, before any others of the Biſhops elect, and not conſecrated at the ſame time together with *four*, or *five*, or *fourteen*, other Biſhops, as it is reported in the

[f] Inſtit. Part 4. p. 321.

Nag's.

Nag's-Head Story: And that he was conſecrated (not by *Scory* only, as the ſame Story reports, but) by the four Biſhops named in the Regiſter, *Barlow*, *Scory*, *Coverdale* and *Hodgskins*, whom the Objectors did not deny, but allow to be the Perſons that conſecrated him; tho' they pretended they were no Biſhops, becauſe they had been deprived of their Biſhopricks, and not reſtored.

9. And if there was a known and common Objection of the *Romaniſts* at that time againſt the Ordination of our Biſhops, grounded upon this Suppoſition, then it follows that the Objectors were not apprized of any ſuch Conſecration of *Parker* as at the *Nag's-Head*; but that it was their Opinion and Belief that he was conſecrated by the Perſons, and in the Manner as it is related in the *Lambeth* Regiſter; only they thought that thoſe four Perſons were not legal Biſhops. And if this was the general Belief and Opinion of the Party; then firſt, what muſt we ſay to the impudent *Author* of the *Nullity of the Prelatick Clergy*, who has the Face to affirm, that the *Nag's-Head* Story [g] *had been conſtantly related and credited by Wiſe Men as a certain Truth, ever ſince the Year* 1559? And what can we ſay to *Le Quien* and the *Remarker*, who are ſo weak as to aſſert with the like Confidence, that it was from the Beginning publick and notorious among the Party? Was it heard of and credited by the Catholicks, and publick and notorious among them, when they objected againſt our Biſhops, *Parker*'s (the firſt of them) being conſecrated by *Barlow*, *Scory*, *Coverdale* and *Hodgskins?* Did they at that time believe that he was conſecrated by thoſe Perſons? then they muſt either not have heard of the *Nag's-Head* Conſecration, or if they had heard of it, muſt have

[g] Sup. p. 115.

looked

looked upon it as no better than a ſcandalous Fable. Secondly, what then can we conceive to have been *Bonner*'s Senſe of the ſame Matter? Can we believe that he, and a few or no Body elſe, believed nothing of the *Lambeth* Conſecration by *Barlow*, *Scory*, *Coverdale* and *Hodgskins*, but were aſſured that *Parker* had really no Conſecration but at the Tavern, when the reſt of the Catholicks believed the contrary? that he and ſome others, who had been preſently informed of that Fact by his Chaplain *Neale*, thought it beſt to keep the Myſtery to themſelves, and not to let it take Air and come abroad among the reſt of their Party, and ſo, for ſo long time after, the Party appeared to believe nothing elſe but that *Parker* was conſecrated (not by *Scory* only but) by *Barlow*, *Scory*, *Coverdale* and *Hodgskins*; and formed an Objection againſt our Ordinations upon this Ground, that theſe four were the Conſecrators of our firſt Arch-Biſhop *Parker*, but were not any one of them legal Biſhops? If this cannot be conceived of *Bonner*, then he muſt be as much a Stranger to the *Nag's-Head* Story as the reſt of the Catholicks.

But then what muſt be his Senſe in that Allegation under his Hand, *That* Horne *had not an Arch-Biſhop and two Biſhops, or four Biſhops, at his Conſecration?* Sir *Edward Coke*, and the other *Writer*, plainly furniſh us with a Key to open his Meaning. The Objection againſt *Horne*'s Conſecration, as well as againſt that of the reſt of the Biſhops who derived their Orders from *Parker*, turned, as they plainly ſhew us, upon the original Defect pretended to be in *Parker*'s Conſecration, that his Conſecrators were no legal Biſhops. Upon this Ground it was pretended that *Parker* was no Arch-Biſhop, and that the reſt who were conſecrated by him were no Biſhops; conſequently, *Horne* being conſecrated by *Parker*, aſſiſted by

by Three others who had been before conſecrated by him, *Bonner* had the ſame ground to pretend that *Horne had not an Arch-Biſhop and two Biſhops or four Biſhops* (or indeed any Biſhop at all) *at his Conſecration*; his four Conſecrators being *Parker*, and three others that had been conſecrated by *Parker*, and none of them having been conſecrated according to Law, becauſe (as Sir *Edward Coke* expreſſes it) *Parker*'s Conſecrators *being Biſhops in the Reign of King* Edw. VI. *were deprived in the Reign of Queen* Mary, *and not reſtored before their Preſence at* Parker's *Conſecration.* This muſt have been *Bonner*'s meaning if the Objection in the Heads of his Defence had the ſame Senſe which it had at that time in the Mouths of the reſt of his Party; which it muſt have had, except we can ſuppoſe, that they believed that *Parker* was conſecrated by *Barlow*, *Scory*, *Coverdale*, and *Hodgskins*; and *Bonner* on the contrary believed at the ſame time that *Parker* and *Horne* and the reſt of the Biſhops were all conſecrated by none but *Scory*.

Sum of the Arguments to prove Bonner's *being unacquainted with this pretended Fact.*

10. And ſo I may conclude that it is evident from the Caſe between *Horne* and *Bonner*; that *Bonner*, who ought to have been firſt and moſt fully informed of the *Nag's-Head* Ordination, never had any ſuch information; becauſe (to ſum up what has been ſaid) firſt [h], he could not, if he had had ſuch Information, have diſſembled his Knowledge of the Fact when he drew up the Heads of his Defence, and have alledged ſo many other things plainly immaterial and impertinent, omitting that which alone would have been ſufficient to carry the Cauſe for him. Secondly, that which I have [i] proved (againſt *Le Quien* and the *Remarker*) to be the principal or only Argument that *Bonner*'s

[h] Sup. p. 188,——191. [i] Sup. p. 197,——200.

Counſel

Counſel intended to inſiſt upon, the want of Re-eſtabliſhment in King *Edward*'s Ordinal, implies a confeſſion of him and his Counſel, that *Horne* was conſecrated in the manner and form preſcribed in that Ordinal, which they cannot be ſuppoſed to confeſs if they knew that he was conſecrated at the *Nag's-Head*. Thirdly, the Argument under his own hand, *That Horne had not an Arch-Biſhop and Two Biſhops or four Biſhops at his Conſecration*, if it be interpreted in that Senſe which I have given [k] very good reaſon to think muſt be the true meaning of it, implies *Bonner*'s acknowledging that *Parker* was conſecrated by *Barlow*, *Scory*, *Coverdale*, and *Hodgskins*, and conſequently his diſclaiming that he had any Knowledge or Belief that he had no Conſecrator but *Scory*, as the *Nag's-Head* Story tells us.

Confutation of the Remarker's *Anſwer to the Argument from the ground of* Bonner's *Plea.*

11. It would not be worth my while, if I were not provoked to it by the Confidence of that Writer, to take notice of the *Remarker*'s Anſwers to the ſecond Argument, *viz. That* [l] *if* Neale *had informed* Bonner *of the Nag's-Head Conſecration*, Bonner *would never have grounded his Plea againſt* Horne *upon the Illegality of the New Ordinal, but upon that Sham-Conſecration at the Tavern.* He produces this as an *Objection made by* Bramhall *and* Williams, *which they ſeem to think* (as he words it with an Air of Contempt) *a very ſmart one.* No doubt it did not appear ſo *ſmart* to his acute Judgment, but his own Anſwers in his Opinion were much ſmarter. I do not find that Biſhop *Bramhall* has this *Objection* any where; but it might be of ſervice to the *Remarker*, to adorn his Triumph, by inſulting (as he does upon all Occaſions) over that great Name, and to magnify himſelf in the Eyes of his Party by confuting him, whether the

[k] Sup. p. 207, 208. [l] P. 297, 298.

Biſhop ſays, or does not at all ſay, that which he pretends to confute. He gives however two Anſwers to the Objection, and the former of them is, *That* Bonner's *alledging the want of the ſtatutable Number of Biſhops at* Horne's *Conſecration, ſhews that he deſigned to prove that* Horne *was not conſecrated according to the New Ordinal and Regiſter*; but (as he ſays preſently) *the Nag's-Head or ſome ſuch way*. Does it ſhew that he muſt deſign to prove this, when it would have been enough to prove that *Horne* had not the ſtatutable Number of Biſhops at his Conſecration, if he had granted that *Horne* had the four Conſecrators named in the Regiſter; but could have proved (upon ſuch Principles as the *Remarker* thinks are ſufficient) that not one of all the four was a true or legal Biſhop? If he could have proved that none of them were Biſhops, does it not follow, that tho' they all laid Hands upon *Horne*, yet he had not Impoſition of Hands from the ſtatutable Number of *Biſhops?*

We ſee then, that *Bonner*, notwithſtanding this Allegation, might not deſign to prove that *Horne* was not conſecrated according to the *Regiſter*. But the *Remarker* goes farther, and ſays it [m] *ſhews he deſigned to prove that* Horne *was not conſecrated according to the* New Ordinal; and his reaſon is *becauſe that Ordinal required the ſtatutable Number of Conſecrators*. True, the *Rubric* of the Ordinal requires an *Arch-Biſhop (or a Biſhop commiſſioned by him) and two other Biſhops*, to perform the Ceremony; but ſuppoſe this Arch-Biſhop and thoſe Biſhops to be not true or legal (but pretended) Biſhops, does it follow that theſe Perſons might not (tho' without Authority) have made uſe of the whole Ceremony and Form of Words in the Ordinal? If they might, then *Bonner*'s Allegation,

[m] P. 298.

that

that *Horne* had not the ſtatutable Number of Biſhops, does not imply that he deſigned to prove, that he was not conſecrated by the Ceremony and Form of Words in that Ordinal, but only, that the Office was not performed by ſuch Perſons as the *Rubric* of the Ordinal preſcribed. The firſt is that which the *Remarker* would make us believe that *Bonner* deſigned to prove, that the Ceremony and Form of Words in the Ordinal was not made uſe of in *Horne*'s Conſecration, but ſome ſuch Ceremony and Form as they pretend *Scory* made uſe of at the *Nag's-Head*; and this, if the *Remarker* could prove it, would be to his purpoſe: But his Acuteneſs did not enable him to ſee the diſtinction between the Rubric relating to the Perſons, and the Ceremony and Form of Words in the Office; and ſo he uſes ſuch a way of Reaſoning, as would ſerve him to prove, that from the beginning of the Reformation the *Engliſh* Liturgy was never read in any of our Churches, becauſe we never had (as he believes) any true Prieſts or Miniſters ſince that time, but the Rubric of the Liturgy requires the Service to be read by a Prieſt or Miniſter; conſequently, according to his way of arguing, there being no Prieſts or Miniſters, it follows, that our Morning and Evening Service, *&c.* tho' it were read duly and conſtantly from that time, by our pretended Prieſts and Miniſters, yet was never read at all, becauſe it was not read by ſuch Perſons as the Rubric required. Thus he may ſee if he pleaſes another *Specimen* that he gives us of his great Judgment and Subtlety (he may call it *Smartneſs*) in this Anſwer, and how much it ſhews him to be an over-match for ſuch a weak Adverſary as Biſhop *Bramhall.*

His other Anſwer, That *Bonner*'s pleading *the Ordinal's not being re-eſtabliſhed was only* [n] *a ſubſi-*

[n] P. 298.

diary Point of Law, which might be alledged without granting the Ordinal was actually uſed in Horne's *Conſecration*, I have ſufficiently proved to be no better than a ſhuffling Evaſion, of his and *Le Quien*'s; and therefore may now leave it to the Reader to judge, whether this very [o] Argument from *Bonner*'s Plea being grounded upon the Illegality of the New Ordinal is not enough to prove effectually, that *Neale* had never informed *Bonner* of the *Nag's-Head* Conſecration.

Bonner's Conduct while his Cauſe lay before the King's-Bench, and when it came before the Parliament, proves he had no thought of objecting to Horne, *that he was ordained at the Tavern.*

12. I may add a farther very good Proof of the ſame Concluſion, from *Bonner*'s own Management of his Cauſe, beſides what appears from the Heads of his Defence, and the Plea of his Counſel about the Ordinal. For what can be more unaccountable than his Conduct, if we ſuppoſe him to have had ſuch Proof to make at his Trial, that his Adverſary was conſecrated at the *Nag's-Head* Tavern? Can it be conceived that a Man of *Bonner*'s Spirit, and Experience in Buſineſs, after he had put in his Plea that *Horne* was no Biſhop, and the Judges had agreed that if he would *he ſhould be well received upon that Iſſue, and the Jury ſhould try it*, ſhould not immediately after by his Counſel join iſſue upon that Plea, and deſire to have a Jury impannelled and warned to be ready to try the Cauſe either before the end of that Term or in the Term following? Having ſuch Aſſurance as he muſt have, that upon the Trial he muſt be acquitted, with great Trimph to himſelf and his Party, and as great Shame and Confuſion to *Horne* and the reſt of his Adverſaries. The Author of *Eraſtus Senior* thinks he has us at a great Advantage, when he puts the Queſtion, [p] *Why did not* Horne *join iſſue?* He brings that as an Argument to prove (not that *Horne* was

[o] P. 93. [p] P. 63.

conſcious

conſcious to himſelf that he was conſecrated at the *Nag's-Head*, but) that he was ſenſible that *in the Opinion of the Judges, King* Edward's *Book of ordering Biſhops*, &c. *was not revived*, 1 Eliz. *and ſo he*, being conſecrated by the Form in that Book, *was no legal Biſhop*. He might have conſider'd, how eaſy and natural it was to retort that Queſtion upon himſelf (and with very much greater Force if he had been an Abettor of the *Nag's-Head* Story) Why did not *Bonner* offer and declare himſelf ready to join iſſue upon his Plea, as ſoon as the Judges had agreed *that he ſhould be well received upon that Iſſue?* And if then or in the next Term *Horne* declined to join iſſue with him, how can it be conceived, that he ſhould not preſs it home upon him; and if he ſhuffled, move the Court to order that either iſſue ſhould be joined, or the Matter of his Plea looked upon as confeſſed by *Horne*, and the Indictment be diſmiſſed out of the Court? And that in every Term following, when he found that by *Horne*'s Default no Iſſue was joined, and that the Court had not taken care to require it of him and his Counſel, or to have a Jury impannelled to try the Cauſe, and a Day appointed for the Trial; he ſhould not, with a juſt and reaſonable Confidence, demand that the Court ſhould either acquit him of the Charge laid againſt him in the Indictment, or bring him to his Trial? Beſides making his Caſe known to his Friends of the Party, that he could not have Juſtice done him, but was prevented by *Horne*'s unfair Practices, and the partiality of the Judges, from juſtifying his Plea in the Face of the Court, and producing unqueſtionable Evidence that neither *Horne* nor any of Queen *Elizabeth*'s pretended Biſhops ever had any true or legal Ordination.

Such a Coldneſs and Indolence in a Man of *Bonner*'s Temper, his tamely ſitting down and neither ſaying nor doing any thing, to obſtruct the

Attempts of his Adverſary to delay and wholly to put off the Trial, muſt be looked upon as a Demonſtration that he had no ſuch Confidence in the Strength of his Cauſe, as he muſt have been inſpir'd with, if he could at the Pleading have alledged the *Nag's-Head* Conſecration. We may ſtill put the Queſtion farther: When the Parliament met that took the Caſe from being decided in a Courſe of Law, into their Cognizance, can it be imagined that *Bonner* knowing this was done by *Horne*'s and the other Biſhops Management, ſhould not ſee how much they were afraid of the Story of the Tavern being trump'd up, and that this ſhould not embolden him to put up a Petition in both Houſes, that his Counſel might be heard againſt the Bill then brought in, *Declaring the making and conſecrating of our Biſhops to be good, lawful, and perfect?* And then his Counſel might have had a fair Opportunity to give a Relation of that Story which is pretended to be the Ground of their Plea, and have informed the Lords and Commons, how the Judges at firſt appeared to be affected with the Plea, and what prevented its being brought to an Iſſue in the Court of *King's-Bench*, as they had reſolved. This *Bonner*'s own Concern, as well as his Zeal for their Church and Religion, muſt oblige him to: And it will not be much for his Honour to ſay he waved it, upon the view of a *Proviſo* in the Bill to indemnify himſelf for what was paſt, the Cauſe being not his alone, but all the reſt of his Deprived Brethren, and the Church of *Rome* and the Holy See, having ſo great an Intereſt in it. But ſetting him aſide, can it be conceived that his Old Friends of that Party, who were Members of the Houſe of Peers and Commons, muſt not have been ſo fully inſtructed in a Caſe ſo publick and notorious, as well as in the Fact of the Conſecration, and ſo well aſſured of the Advantages it gave them, as

to expoſe both the Biſhops and the Judges before their Faces, by what the Counſel or their own Knowledge enabled them to relate of the Hiſtory of the Ordination, and the Proceedings before the Court below upon the Plea, and to have ſpoken with a juſt Freedom againſt the Bill that lay before them, *Declaring* Biſhops (ordained in ſuch a ſcandalous manner) to have had a *good*, *lawful*, and *perfect* Ordination? Should they not rather have proceeded ſo far, as to move that, ſince all the Biſhops that ſat in that Parliament had no Title to their Places there, or Sees in the Church, but deſerved rather to be impeached and caſt in a *Præmunire* for their unlawful and profane Conſecration, another Bill might be brought in to remove the whole Bench, and to reſtore their Old Fathers to their Biſhopricks and their Seats in Parliament? They had a good Precedent for this Liberty of Speech, from the firſt Seſſion of this Parliament 5 *Eliz.* in the Account whereof two of the Speeches that were made are preſerved to us, [p] Mr. *Atkinſon*'s in the Houſe of Commons, and Viſcount *Mountague*'s in the Houſe of Peers; and the latter does not appear to have had any ſuch Diſcouragement for his Speech, but that he might with as good aſſurance have ſpoken again in this Seſſion, and been well ſeconded by the other Popiſh Lords, of whom no fewer than ten joined with him in giving their Votes againſt that Bill, when it was read and concluded with the Conſent of the Houſe, *Novemb.* 2. 1566. as appears from the Journals and *Strype*'s Annals [q].

[p] *Strype*'s Annals of Queen *Eliz.* Vol. I. p. 259, 263.

[q] Vol. I. p. 493. where, inſtead of, *concluded with the Conſent of the Diſſenting Peers, theſe, the Earl of* Northumberland, *&c.* it ſhould be read, concluded with the Conſent of the Houſe, the Diſſenting Peers being theſe, the Earl of *Northumberland*, &c.

This was the Time for the Hiſtory of the Tavern-Conſecration to have been publiſhed (I may ſay) with Authority, that is, to have been fully declared before the Lords and Commons in Parliament, by ſuch Perſons in either Houſe as could not be ignorant of that which *from the Year* 1559 *had been heard of, credited and related, by the wiſe and ſober Catholicks:* And if it had been made out by them, and yet they had been over-powered, and the Bill paſſed by a *corrupt Majority* in both Houſes, what Noiſe and Clamour muſt there have been of the Party without Doors at that time; and how could we fail to have heard of it the Year after from *Stapleton* in his *Counterblaſt*, and from *Harding* in his *Detection*, the Year following, and alſo from their Hiſtorian *Sanders*, who had the Confidence to treat *Parker* as no Arch-Biſhop, in the Dedication of his *Rock of the Church* to him, *Ann.* 1567, and could not have failed to expoſe the Iniquity of this Proceeding ſome Years after, when he writ his Hiſtory of the Schiſm?

LeQuien's Romantick *Account of the Caſe between* Bonner *and* Horne.

13. In ſhewing that *Bonner* never had any Information of the *Nag's-Head* Story, I have taken notice of what I meet with of Argument, in F. *Le Quien*, to prove the contrary: The reſt that he has, relating to the Caſe between *Bonner* and *Horne*, is a Story very near as romantick as the Grand Fable. He tells us, That [r] Bonner *being deprived by Queen* Elizabeth, *and lying in Priſon in a Place in* Wincheſter *Dioceſs*, Horne *the Biſhop, with Deſign to ruin* Bonner *entirely, bethought himſelf of tendering him the Oath of Supremacy*; That *he lodged a Certificate of* Bonner's *refuſing the Oath in the King's Bench, where* Bonner *was ſummoned to anſwer*; That Bonner *alledged that the Oath*

[r] T. 1. p. 249, & ſeq.

could

could not by Law be tendered to a Biſhop (*Eccleſiaſtical Perſon* he ſhould have ſaid) *but by a Biſhop, and that* Horne *ought firſt to prove himſelf to be a Biſhop*; That Horne *by this Anſwer found a Stop was put to his Proceedings*, and inſtead of being Plaintiff againſt *Bonner*, was obliged to take the Place of Defendant, and *to make Proof of his own Conſecration*. This ſeems to be intended to give the credulous Reader an Idea of *Horne*'s commencing a malicious Proſecution againſt *Bonner*, and of his finding, upon *Bonner*'s Plea, that in ſuing that Prelate he had, as he deſerved, *catcht a Tartar:* But any one that reads Arch-Biſhop *Parker*'s[s] Letter to the reſt of the Biſhops in relation to the tendering the Oath appointed by the Statute 5 *Eliz.* to the Popiſh Biſhops and Clergy, will ſee good Reaſon to believe that it was the Arch-Biſhop's, Secretary *Cecil*'s, and Queen *Elizabeth*'s Mind, that the Oath appointed to be tendered by the Biſhops to Eccleſiaſtical Perſons, ſhould not be, as in fact it was not, adminiſtred to any others of them; but that *Bonner* only, as a Perſon ſo odious for his barbarous Cruelty in the former Reign, ſhould be ſingled out to be made an Example of upon this Occaſion; and when it was thought fit to ſummon him to take the Oath, it fell to *Horne* to act that Part, it being by Law to be done by the Biſhop in whoſe Dioceſs he was; and ſo it was done by *Horne*, not out of any malicious Contrivance of his own, but in Compliance with the Meaſures reſolved upon by his Superiors. This may correct the Miſrepreſentation in the Beginning of *Le Quien*'s Story, and vindicate *Horne* from the Charge of perſonal Pique or Malice, and *bethinking himſelf* of this Way to accompliſh *his Deſign of compleating* Bonner's *Ruin*. It is true, that *Horne* adminiſtred

[s] Strype's Life of Matth. Parker, p. 125, 126,

the

the Oath to him, and certified his Refuſal of it in the King's-Bench, and *Bonner* was indicted thereupon, and his laſt Plea in Anſwer to the Indictment was, that *Horne* was not empowered to adminiſter the Oath to him, as not himſelf being a Biſhop. The reſt, That this *ſtopped Horne*, and turned him from *Plaintiff* to *Defendant*, and obliged him to prove his own Conſecration, muſt, as well as every thing elſe that follows, be imputed to F. *Le Quien*'s Invention.

14. He ſays, Horne *firſt pleaded that he was duly ordained, but when he was to make Proof of the Fact, he lingered and ſpun out the Matter in length*; and how he prolonged it he tells us preſently, upon no leſs Authority (as he pretends) than *Dyer*'s *Reports*, from whoſe Words he ſays, [t] *We may ſee that the Enquiry into the Fact being firſt committed to a Jury of* Middleſex, Horne *refuſed that Jury, and demanded another of the County of* Surrey, *in his Dioceſs of* Wincheſter, *and out of* Southwark *and* (a Hamlet of *Le Quien*'s diſcovering called) *Vicanet*, both Places (as he ſays) *under the Juriſdiction of the See of* Canterbury: And that it was this (*Chicane* or) Trick of *Horne*'s that made the Trial be put off till the next Parliament ſhould meet, *where he hoped to come off better.* He refers us for this to *Dyer*'s *Reports*, and even to the Paſſage tranſcribed from thence in Mr. *Maſon*, where any one that reads *Maſon* or *Dyer* will find the *Report* ſets down *Bonner*'s third Plea in anſwer to the Indictment (before his laſt, of *Horne*'s being *No Biſhop*) viz. [v] *That he was indicted by the Common Jury of Inqueſt in the King's Bench for the County of* Middleſex, *according to the Statute of the fifth Year of the preſent Queen; and he pleads that he is not culpable for that: And it was held*

[t] T. 1. p. 251. [v] Maſon, l. 3. c. 11. §. 6. p. 380.

(ſays

(ſays *Dyer*) *that the Trial ſhould not be by Men of the County of* Middleſex, *but by Men of the County of* Surrey, *of the* Vicanet, (i. e. *Neighbourhood*) *of* Southwark, *becauſe no Mention is made in the Statute of the Trial, but only of the Indictment, which is warranted to be in the County where the King's Bench is ſitting.* Could any one that had read this Paſſage, in *Dyer* or *Maſon*, tell us we may ſee in theſe Words, that Horne *refuſed the Jury of* Middleſex, *and demanded a Jury of* Surrey, when it is plain from the Words, that the Exception againſt the Jury of *Middleſex* was made by *Bonner*, and not by *Horne?* Not that the Court determined the Jury to be of *Surrey*, in Compliance at all with *Bonner*'s Demand, but in Obedience to the Law, which required the Fact to be tried by a Jury of the County where it was committed. And is it not as plain from the *Reports*, that the Judges, on Occaſion of that third Plea of *Bonner*'s, had declared that the Trial ſhould be by a Jury of *Surrey?* Could there be then, after this, any room for *Horne*, under the Pretext of getting a Jury of that County, to ſpin out the Matter by Delays, and to put off the Trial? And yet *Le Quien* tells us this too is plain from *Dyer*'s *Reports*, from whence the quite contrary is evident. But *Le Quien*, when he read either *Dyer* or *Maſon*, was poſſeſſed with a ſtrong Impreſſion of the *Nag's-Head* Story, and therefore could ſee nothing elſe but a Dream or Viſion, of *Horne*'s being in a great Agony for fear his Sham-Ordination ſhould be diſcovered at the Trial, which made him firſt labour hard to get a Jury which might be favourable, of his own Dioceſs and Neighbourhood; and after that not dare to truſt his Cauſe even to a Jury of his own chuſing, but reſolve to put off the Trial, and remove the Cauſe to a higher Court, where, as *Le Quien* ſays, *he* might have *Hopes to come off better.* All this

this is Romance and Fiction, and yet *Le Quien* gives it us for Matter of Fact, upon the Authority of *Dyer*'s *Reports*. But to ſee how the Argument turns upon himſelf. *Horne*, he pretends, was in fear that a Jury of *Middleſex* might be favourable to *Bonner* and not to him; how then muſt we conceive that *Bonner* would make Exceptions againſt that Jury that was like to be moſt favourable to himſelf? Should we not rather, on the contrary, have Reaſon to think that he was moſt afraid of coming before a *Middleſex* Jury; *London* and *Middleſex* having been the Stage whereupon he had acted ſo much Cruelty againſt the Proteſtants? Not but that his odious Character was ſo well known in *Southwark* croſs the Water, that himſelf [w] complains that he was in Danger of his Life while he was paſſing between the *Marſhalſea* and the Biſhop of *Wincheſter*'s Palace; ſo that he had no great Reaſon neither to wiſh for a Jury out of that Neighbourhood. But our Surmiſes, from what we fancy he or *Horne* might have Reaſon to do, are no Ground to relate it as Matter of Fact. *Le Quien* [x] goes on to vouch Dr. *Heylin* to confirm his Story, and ſets down a pretty large Paſſage out of his *Hiſtory of the Reformation*, in Words at length, with a Reference in the Margin to a Page, but without the Number; with good Reaſon, becauſe it is no where to be found; and then proceeds to enlarge in his Complaints, why there ſhould be ſo long Delays, and why the Jury ſhould be refuſed, when if the Fact of *Horne*'s Ordination had been clear, he had no Reaſon to diſtruſt the Verdict of an honeſt *Middleſex* Jury, nor would the *Surrey* Jury have had any Reaſon to delay their Verdict, which they might have given in ſo clear a Caſe without ever going from the Bar? He proceeds to make

[w] Sup. p. 190. [x] Ibid.

another Diſcovery from *Dyer*'s *Reports*, by the Strength of his own Imagination, *viz.* [y] that from thence it appears that the *Jurors* for *Bonner*'s Trial were *named by the Judges*. The Words in *Dyer* are no more than that *it was held* by the Judges *that the Trial ſhould be by Men of the County of* Surrey; and it muſt be ſtrange that a Man of the Lord Chief Juſtice *Dyer*'s Eminency in the Profeſſion ſhould ſay that the *Engliſh* Juries were named by the Judges, and not by the Sheriffs.

LeQuien's *Attempt to prove that* Bonner *denied the Fact of* Horne's *Ordination from what he makes to be the Office of an* Engliſh *Jury.*

15. But it was of Service to *Le Quien* ſo to underſtand him, and to draw from thence a Concluſion of great Importance, That *Bonner* in his Plea *abſolutely denied that* Horne *was Biſhop in any reſpect whatſoever*. His Ground is, becauſe the Buſineſs of the Jury was not to enquire *whether* Horne's *Conſecration was legal or not*, but into the *Fact, whether he was ordained or no, in any manner whatſoever:* And that this was all they had to do, he proves from a Diſcovery, of the Nature and Office of our Juries, in a former Writer, the Author of *Eraſtus Sen. viz.* that the Juries are only to try the Fact, and the Judges to determine the Point of Law. Suppoſing this to be true, what Occaſion had *Le Quien* to bring it for a Proof of *Bonner*'s Plea being only of the Fact of *Horne*'s Ordination, *That the Judges named the Jury?* For if the *Engliſh* Juries have nothing to do in any Cauſe before them, but only to try the Point of Fact, there being a Jury appointed to try the Cauſe, is enough to prove it to be only of the Fact, by whomſoever the Perſons of the Jurors are named, whether by the Judges, or the Sheriffs, or any other Perſon that the Law appoints. So that *Le Quien* appears to have been

[y] T. 1. p. 255.

in

in the dark, and to have loſt himſelf, when he produces *Dyer*'s Authority for this Dream of his own. And he ſeems to be under the ſame Deluſion in the Uſe he makes of the Author of *Eraſtus Sen.* That Writer ſays this, as he is proſecuting the Argument that takes up a third part of his Book, *viz.* That our firſt Prelates were not legal Biſhops, becauſe they were ordained by the Form in King *Edward*'s Ordinal. He is upon this Argument from the fourteenth Chapter to the twenty firſt; and in the ſeventeenth and eighteenth takes upon him to prove from *Bonner*'s Caſe, that the Judges who received his Plea had this Opinion of King *Edward*'s Ordinal, that it was not legally reſtored 1 *Eliz.* and conſequently that *Horne* was no legal Biſhop; and that this occaſioned *Horne*'s not *joining Iſſue*, and *the Cauſe never coming to a Hearing*, and *Sentence being delayed*, as he expreſſes it, (tho' if the Plea was only *entered*, as he ſays, and *never came to a Hearing*, it could not be ripe for Sentence) *for two Years or near upon*, and the Cauſe at laſt being left *to the Parliament.* He takes Advantage of what *Heylin* ſays, that *it was adviſed to refer the Deciſion of it to the following Parliament, for fear ſuch a weighty Cauſe ſhould miſcarry by a Country* (*Eraſtus* reads *contrary*) *Jury:* But this Reaſon, why it might be thought adviſable, *Eraſtus* rejects, *becauſe the Point of Law, whether King* Edward's *Form was legal, was not to be put to the Jury, but to be determined by the Judges, and the Jury to try only the Matter of Fact, whether* Horne *were conſecrated by that Form.* Here the Author plainly *ſuppoſes Bonner*'s Plea to have been grounded upon the Point of Law which he himſelf was arguing for, That King *Edward*'s Form, by which *Horne* was conſecrated was not legal; but as *Le Quien* ſhews, who underſtands him better than he does himſelf, he is ſo unhappy as to prove that the Plea was

grounded

grounded upon the Point of Fact, That *Horne* was not conſecrated by that Form, but had no Conſecration whatſoever. Either therefore that Author did not himſelf know what he ſaid, or *Le Quien* is once more bewildred.

16. The *Remarker* ſees this Diſcovery of *Eraſtus* in the ſame Light as *Le Quien*; but as he improves it, makes the Matter worſe. He ſets down [z] the whole Paſſage, as very edifying, and in the Concluſion is ſo tranſported as to ſay, *Nothing can be ſtronger in a Point of this Nature, and it ſeems next to a Demonſtration.* But what is it ſo ſtrong a Proof of, as to come near to a Demonſtration? It follows, *That the Fact of* Horne's *Conſecration by King* Edward's *Ordinal could not ſtand the Verdict of a Jury.* If it could not, then the Jury muſt have found that there really was no ſuch Fact, but that *Horne* never was conſecrated by that Ordinal. And if this is demonſtrated by the Author of *Eraſtus*, then he, whoſe Buſineſs it is in ſo many Chapters, from the fourteenth to the end of his Book, to prove that *Parker, &c.* were no legal Biſhops, becauſe they were conſecrated by the Form in King *Edward*'s Ordinal; and particularly in this eighteenth Chapter, to prove that the Judges looked upon *Horne* as no legal Biſhop, becauſe he was conſecrated by that Form; this Author, in the ſame Chapter, muſt unwarily bring againſt himſelf a Proof *next to Demonſtration*, That in fact *Horne* was not conſecrated by that Form, and conſequently ſhew that he himſelf had been all the while playing the Fool, and arguing upon the Foundation of that Fact, which himſelf in this Paſſage proves to be falſe. So happy is he in having the *Remarker* for a Commentator upon his Text, and ſo happy is the *Re-*

[z] P. 289, 290.

marker himſelf, in making good his Profeſſion of carefully comparing the Authors he cites, which he does to ſo very good Purpoſe, as to make them ſpeak his Senſe, in Contradiction to their own.

There is no room here for the like ſhuffling Evaſion, as he and *Le Quien* make uſe of in regard to *Bonner*'s Plea; *viz.* That the Author of *Eraſtus*'s true Meaning was, that our Biſhops were not conſecrated by the Ordinal, but at the *Nag's-Head*, and that he argues here only *upon a Suppoſition* that they were conſecrated by the Ordinal. It is plain he ſays as directly that they were conſecrated by the Form in the Ordinal, as that the Form in that Ordinal was not legal; theſe are his Premiſſes, upon which he grounds this Concluſion, that they were not legal Biſhops. And he had before as freely owned, that *Parker* was confirmed and conſecrated by *Barlow*, *Scory*, *Coverdale* and *Hodgskins*; ſo that he can be no more an Advocate for the *Nag's-Head* Fable, than the Form in the Ordinal, and *Scory*'s Ceremony at the *Nag's-Head*, can be the ſame; or than *Scory*, *Barlow*, *Coverdale* and *Hodgskins*, can be but one and the ſame ſingle Perſon.

But the *Remarker* may yet pretend, that by the Author of *Eraſtus*'s Reaſoning it appears, that the Caſe being to be tried by a Jury, it muſt be of the Fact; and by *Horne*'s declining the Trial it is plain he was ſenſible that the Fact would not ſtand the Verdict of a Jury. I may leave the Reaſoning of the Author of *Eraſtus* to be conſidered by better Judges of the Profeſſion, who know beſt whether the *Engliſh* Juries are only to try the Matter of Fact: It is enough for me to ſay to that Author, that by his Reaſoning the Jury appointed to try the Caſe between *Bonner* and *Horne* muſt have had no Buſineſs at all. The Fact in the Caſe, he ſays, was *Whether* Horne *was conſecrated by the Form in King* Edward's *Ordinal.*

dinal. This Fact muſt have been pleaded in the affirmative by *Bonner*'s Counſel, as the Ground upon which they alledged that *Horne* had no legal Conſecration: The ſame Fact muſt be admitted by the Counſel for *Horne*, becauſe they could not make it out that *Horne* was a legal Biſhop, without allowing or proving that he was conſecrated by that Form. If the Fact had been denied, either by the Counſel for *Bonner* or *Horne*, the Jury would have been to try it, and examine Witneſſes; but as it was confeſſed on both Sides, the Jury (if as that Author ſays they were to try the Fact only) muſt ſtand at the Bar and have nothing to do in this Caſe.

16. It is more material to obſerve what the *Remarker* confidently affirms of *Horne*'s declining the Trial, and the Conſequence that he infers from that Suggeſtion. *Horne*, [a] he ſays, *ſought Delays for near two Years, unwilling to have the* Fact *of his Ordination tried by a Jury.* Here, tho' it ſhould be granted him that *Horne* was willing to put off the Trial, yet he might have learnt from the Author of *Eraſtus Sen.* that he has no Ground for this Concluſion. That Author ſays, that *Horne* declined the joining Iſſue with *Bonner* and coming to a Trial; but for what Reaſon? Not for fear of the Jury's bringing in a Verdict againſt the Fact of his Ordination, but of the Judges giving Sentence that King *Edward*'s Ordinal was not revived 1 *Eliz.* and conſequently *Horne*'s Conſecration by that Form was illegal, and himſelf no lawful Biſhop. If this might be the true Reaſon, what Ground has the *Remarker* to infer, that That muſt be the true Reaſon which he is pleaſed rather to give us? But his Confidence riſes higher, and he dares ap-

Confutation of the Remarker's *Pretence that* Horne *declined bringing the Cauſe to a Trial, for fear it ſhould be proved that he was ordained at the* Nag's Head.

[a] P. 289.

peal to *Horne*'s own Conſcience for this Proof of his having no better Ordination than at the Tavern. "*Horne*, [b] he ſays, knew that *Bonner* had Proofs "of the *Nag's-Head* Ordination, and dreaded "the Proofs, and therefore never brought it to a "Trial. Let me aſk him, how he came to know the Secret of *Horne*'s guilty Conſcience better than the Author of *Eraſtus*, who makes him not let it come to a Trial for this Reaſon, that he dreaded the Judges would give it againſt him, becauſe he was conſecrated (not by the *Nag's-Head* Ceremonial, but) by King *Edward*'s Ordinal, not at that time authorized by Parliament? If this was all that this Writer could infer from that Suppoſition, how can the *Remarker*, with any Colour of Reaſon, or Degree of Modeſty, infer from thence that *Horne* was convicted in his own Conſcience that he was made Biſhop at the Tavern? What Account can be given of their different Way of arguing? None, but that the Author of *Eraſtus* was ſo wiſe as to ſee it would do him no Credit to appear in the Defence of the *Nag's-Head* Fable, but lays the Foundation of his Arguments againſt our Orders, upon the Conſecration of *Parker*, by King *Edward*'s Form (not ſufficient to confer the Order, nor legal becauſe not reſtored by Parliament) and by *Barlow* and three other Biſhops not legally poſſeſſed of Epiſcopal Sees ſince their Deprivation by Queen *Mary:* But the *Remarker* has another Spirit and Forehead, and is not either afraid or aſhamed to aſſert and maintain that ſcandalous Impoſture at all Adventures; tho' we have better Reaſon to appeal to his Conſcience, that he is ſelf-convicted *there is a Lye in his right Hand*, than he has to appeal to Biſhop *Horne*'s, that he was conſcious that he was ordained at that Tavern; which if he had been, he muſt (to uſe

[b] P. 298.

the

the *Remarker*'s Expreſſion) be *eminently mad*, to commence a Proſecution againſt *Bonner*, the Iſſue of which he muſt foreſee would be to have his Mock-Ordination expoſed openly, and proved before a Court of Juſtice, and himſelf declared liable to forfeit his Biſhoprick of *Wincheſter*, his own Eſtate, and the Queen's Protection, and to make an Exchange of his Palace in *Southwark* for *Bonner*'s Priſon.

But it has been already ſufficiently proved that the Plea of *Bonner*'s Counſel was grounded upon *Horne*'s being conſecrated by King *Edward*'s Form, not then, as was pretended, legally reeſtabliſhed, by reaſon of the Omiſſion in the Statute 1 *Eliz.* of reſtoring King *Edward*'s Ordinal in expreſs Words. And if the Event of that Cauſe depended upon the Iſſue of that Plea, neither *Bonner* nor *Horne* had certain Grounds to be ſo aſſured of carrying the Cauſe, but that both of them might be willing that the Caſe ſhould lie undetermined, and never come to a final Hearing in *Weſtminſter-Hall*. The Judges, tho' they rejected the other Exceptions of *Bonner*'s Counſel againſt the Indictment, thought this Plea deſerved to be conſidered, and after a pretty long Debate were unanimous in their Reſolution that it ſhould be received upon Iſſue, and tried by the proper Jury; and it was to be argued by ſome Counſel of the moſt eminent in the Profeſſion, who were as able to maintain the Illegality of *Horne*'s Conſecration, as the Author of *Eraſtus Sen.* *by whom* [c] the *Remarker* ſays *we may ſee it ſtrongly ſupported.* *Horne* therefore, or the Counſel of his Side, might have Reaſon not to be confident of the Victory, and ſo might be willing that it ſhould not come to a Trial. On the other hand, *Le Quien* [d] makes no Difficulty to own, that *if that were the Point*

[c] P. 290. [d] T. 1. p. 254.

in queſtion, neither Bonner *nor his Counſel could hope but that the Judges, notwithſtanding the Ordinal had not been expreſly reſtored in Form by Queen* Elizabeth's *firſt Parliament, would certainly have interpreted the Declaration that re-eſtabliſhed the Book of Common Prayer, of which the Ordinal was a Part in King* Edward's *time, in favour of our Biſhops:* And if *Bonner* or his Counſel could have no better Hopes, he had as good Reaſon to deſire not to let it come to a Trial, the Iſſue whereof he might juſtly fear would be his being caſt in a *Præmunire.* Dr. *Heylin* ſays, when it was agreed that it ſhould be tried by a Jury, *it was adviſed withal to refer the* Deciſion *to the following Parliament*; and the Author of *Eraſtus* [c] is ready to tell us, that the Advice was given *by the Judges to* Horne, *and not to* Bonner. Neither he nor we may be certain that the Advice was given to the one and not to the other; but ſuppoſe it was given to *Horne*, or the Counſel for him, it is very plain that both *Bonner* and his Counſel were as quie and paſſive all the time, both while the Trial was kept off, and when the Deciſion was coming on in the following Parliament, as if they had received the ſame Advice; and as there was no Motion for a Trial by the Counſel on either Side, there is no Reaſon to lay the Blame of the Delay on the one Side rather than the other. But tho' it were granted that *Horne* was anſwerable for keeping off the Trial, yet all the Conſequence that can be drawn from it is no more than that he was apprehenſive that the Court might declare his Conſecration to be illegal for want of the Ordinal's being expreſly re-eſtabliſhed in Queen *Elizabeth*'s firſt Parliament; and not, as the *Remarker* is forward to conclude, that he was conſcious of his being made Biſhop at the *Nag's-Head*, and

[c] C. 18.

dreaded the Proofs that *Bonner* had to produce of it at the Trial.

I conclude this Chapter with a ſhort Obſervation upon the Author of the MS. cited above from the *Cotton* Library, and the latter Part of the Extract from that Diſcourſe. The Author appears, by the very Title, not to be biaſſed in favour of the Biſhops, the Deſign of his Diſcourſe being to prove, that they had not by Law ſuch Juriſdiction as they exerciſed in their Courts, and that they were liable to a *Præmunire* for exerciſing ſuch Juriſdiction without warrant. But beſides this, in the Matter lying before him, of the Objections againſt the Conſecrations of our Biſhops, he firſt [f] gives up the Conſecrations of *Parker* and the Biſhops conſecrated by him, and the Ordinations of the inferior Clergy by them, as not legal till after they were confirmed by the Statute 8 *Eliz. which*, he ſays, *was neceſſary for their Confirmation*, tho' *he does not deny but after that Statute their Conſecrations were* lawful. This ſhews him not to have been in a Diſpoſition to conceal any thing that he knew was alledged againſt them in *Bonner*'s Caſe, or otherwiſe, or to diſſemble the Force of the Objections which he mentions. *Farther Obſervations from the MS. in the* Cotton *Library.*

Secondly, he alledges *Parker*'s Words in his *Deſcription of his own Life, that his Conſecration ſo paſſed* lege quâdam de hâc re latâ, as not being capable to be underſtood of any Law or *Act of Parliament*, but this Statute 8 *Eliz.* And in this Miſtake of the Arch-Biſhop's Meaning he is followed by Sir *Edward Coke* [g]. But it muſt plainly appear to be a Miſtake to any one that reads the Paſſage in *Parker*'s Life with due Attention. The Words are, "[h] Adhibitis quatuor Epiſco-

[f] Sup. p. 193, 194. [g] Inſtitutes, Part 4. c. 74. p. 322. Strype's Annals, Vol. 1. p. 238. [h] Matthæus in Strype's Appendix to his Life of Parker, p. 151.

" pis, W. Ciceſtrenſi, Johanne Hereford enſi, " Milone quondam Exonienſi, & Richardo (by Miſtake for *Johanne*) " Bedfordenſi, Lege quâ- " dam de hâc re latâ requiſitis, conſecratus eſt." The Law there referr'd to, by which four Biſhops are required to join in the Conſecration of an Arch-Biſhop, could be no other but the Statute 25 *Hen.* VIII. which requires either an Arch-Biſhop and two Biſhops, or four Biſhops; and this Statute being in part revived *primo Elizabethæ*, preſcribed the Number of Biſhops by whom *Parker* was to be confirmed and conſecrated: And he could not mean any other Statute but this, much leſs ſay that he was conſecrated by vertue of a Statute made for his Conſecration ſo many Years after he was conſecrated. The Words, in Sir *Edward Coke*'s Citation, are, *Adhibitis quatuor Epiſcopis &c. lege quâdam de hâc re lata*, requiſitus *conſecratus eſt:* Where the Miſtake of *requiſitus* for *requiſitis*, may be not the Author's, but of the Preſs. But both his and the former Writer's Miſtake of the Law, might proceed from their taking it to be a Law made in Queen *Elizabeth*'s Reign, and their not knowing of any Statute made by her that could relate to *Parker*'s Conſecration, but that which confirmed the Conſecrations of him and the reſt of the Biſhops in the Parliament of her eighth Year.

But tho' they were miſtaken in the Uſe which they make of this Citation of *Parker*'s Life, yet we ſee the very Words of it cited in them, at the time when they writ; and the MS. Diſcourſe in the *Cotton* Library was certainly writ in Queen *Elizabeth*'s time, and probably many Years before her Death, at that Juncture when the Party diſaffected to the Church were buſy in ſetting all Hands at work to oppoſe the Tyranny, as they pretended to call it, of the Biſhops, in the Exerciſe of their Juriſdiction. And if ſo, it follows

that

that his *Life*, with the Account in it of his Conſecration, by four Biſhops named there, was extant at that time. Whether this Writer ſaw the Life in a ſingle Copy apart, or in one annexed to the preceding Lives of *Cardinal Poole* and the former Arch-Biſhops in the *Antiquities*, it is not material. It is enough that there was then (and probably ſo much earlier as the Year 1572.) an Account extant in Print of the Arch-Biſhop's Conſecration, at the *Time*, by the *Perſons*, and in the *Manner* there related; confirming the Truth of the like Relation in the *Lambeth* Regiſter, and as fully proving the Falſhood and Forgery of the oppoſite *Nag's-Head Story*. *Le Quien*, no queſtion, would have been as forward to declare at Random, that this *Life*, as well as [i] *Parker's Book of the Antiquities of the* Britiſh *Church*, *was not ſpoken of during the Space of forty Years, by any Author, Catholick or Proteſtant.* But he might eaſily have ſeen himſelf *dementi* by the Citation in this *Writer*.

[i] T. 1. p. 411.

CHAP. VII.

Bonner's *never having been informed of the Fact of the* Nag's-Head *Ordination proves that the* Writers *of that time could have no Knowledge of it.* Fitzherbert's *Pretence that it was known to* Harding *and* Stapleton, *and objected by them to* Jewel *and* Horne. Stapleton's *Readineſs to vent any Scandal againſt the* Reformers *ſhews he could not have forborne to lay this Fact to their Charge if he had known of it. His firſt Objection againſt their Ordinations proves that he was utterly ignorant of their being ordained at the Tavern. He does not deny (as* Le Quien *pretends) that they had any Impoſition of Hands at all, but only that they had Hands laid upon them by true Biſhops. This proved from his Words alledged by* Le Quien *in the ſeveral Places of his* Fortreſs of Faith, Counterblaſt to *Horne, and* Return of Untruths to *Jewel. His ſaying that the* Proteſtants refuſe the Sacrament of Orders *no Proof of his Meaning that they refuſed Ordination. His Words in the* Promptuarium Catholicum, *cannot be underſtood of his denying any thing more than that our Prelates had no Impoſition of Biſhops Hands. His Words in the* Relectio Principiorum Doctrinalium *do not require to be underſtood in any other Senſe. The* Remarker's *Ignorance of the State of the Point in Diſpute. The time of the Author's writing the* Relectio, &c. *proves that he then knew nothing of the* Nag's-Head *Story.*

1. I am

1. I Am now to proceed to ſhew the Story of the Tavern-Conſecration to be a Forgery of later Date, from our never hearing a Word of it from the Popiſh *Writers* againſt the Church of *England* who were cotemporary with *Bonner*, *Harding*, *Stapleton*, *Briſtow*, *&c.* beſides *Sanders*, whoſe being ignorant of the Fact I have proved already. *Le Quien* and our other modern Adverſaries are as poſitive that theſe *Writers* meant the *Nag's-Head* Ordination in what they object againſt our firſt Biſhops, as they are that *Bonner* muſt have that Meaning in his Plea againſt *Horne* and the Defence of it; and accordingly, after [a] *Bonner* is produced by *Le Quien* to give in his Evidence, *Stapleton*, *Briſtow*, *Harding*, *Sanders*, and *Oſorius*, a foreign *Portugueſe* Prelate, are called out by him to bear their Teſtimony. But if *Bonner* was a Stranger to the whole Matter, as has been proved, how could any of theſe Perſons come to have Information of it? The original Reporter and Eye-witneſs of the Fact was, if we give Credit to the Hiſtory, no other than *Bonner*'s Chaplain *Neale*, diſpatched by that Biſhop to the Tavern to frighten *Landaff* from doing the Office, and to obſerve what Courſe the Biſhops elect might take upon the Diſappointment. And can it be imagined that *Neale*, when he came back with a full Account of all that he ſaw and heard at the Meeting, ſhould forget to inform his Lord and Patron, who waited for a Relation of it at his Return, and take more Care to ſend an Account to *Harding* at *Salisbury*, and either to write or carry the Story to *Oxford*, where *Sanders*, *Stapleton*, *Briſtow*, and *Reynolds* (probably there at that time) might have it from him? We may very well conceive that *Neale* muſt be ſo well ſatisfied

Bonner's never having been informed of the Fact of the Nag's-Head *Ordination, proves that the* Writers *of that time could have no Knowledge of it.*

[a] T. 1. c. 8. §. 2. p. 249. 259, 282, 287, 309, 319.

with

with having executed his Commiſſion with ſo good Succeſs (as to drive away *Landaff* from the Meeting and oblige the *Candidates* for the Epiſcopal Order to ſubmit to ſuch a ſcandalous Way of gratifying their Ambition) that he could not fail to make all Haſte from the *Nag's-Head* to the *Tower* or *Marſhalſea*, to acquaint *Bonner* with the whole Tranſaction, and to concert Meaſures with his Lord, how it might be laid open to the World with the greateſt Advantage, and a proper Uſe be made of it to ruin the newly-raiſed Proteſtant *Hierarchy*. This one would think ſhould have been *Neale*'s firſt Buſineſs when he left the Tavern: But if, as has been found, he never ſpoke a Word of it to *Bonner*, but let him be in perfect Ignorance both at that time and ſix Years after, when that Biſhop was indicted in the *King's-Bench*, and wanted nothing but this Account of *Parker*'s and *Horne*'s Ordination, to free him from the Danger of being brought in guilty of a *Præmunire*; how can we imagine that this ſame Eye-witneſs had acquainted *Harding*, *Stapleton*, *&c.* with the Story, and enabled them to charge our Biſhops with the Want of the Order upon that Foundation, at the ſame time when *Bonner* could find no ſuch Ground for his Plea, tho' nothing could be more neceſſary or effectual for his Defence?

Fitzherbert's *Pretence that it was known to* Harding *and* Stapleton, *and objected by them to* Jewel *and* Horne.

2. The Jeſuit *Fitzherbert* was the firſt that made uſe of this Artifice to impoſe upon the credulous Party. When Mr. *Maſon*, *Ann.* 1613. publiſhed his *Engliſh* Work, *Of the Conſecration of our Biſhops*, and made Proof [b] from the publick Regiſter, of the Conſecration of *Parker* and others at the Chapel in *Lambeth*; the beſt Method that Jeſuit could think of to ſave the Credit of the *Nag's-Head* Report from being utterly deſtroyed

[b] B. 3. c. 4, 5, 6.

by

by the Authority of our Records, was to blind his Readers with this Pretence, that it was not a late Report, but an old Story, of fifty Years ſtanding at his time, and known ſo early as the Beginning of Queen *Elizabeth*'s Reign to *Harding* and *Stapleton*, and objected by them at that time to their Adverſaries *Jewell* and *Horne*. I ſhall ſet down from him as much as is proper in his own Words: " [c] This Exception of ours touching " the lawful Vocation and Conſecration of the " firſt Proteſtant Biſhops in the late Queen's " Days, is not a *new Quarrel* lately raiſed by us " two only, I mean the Author of the *Preface* to " the *Diſcuſſion*, and myſelf, but vehemently urged " divers times heretofore by many other Catho- " licks many Years ago; yea in the Beginning " of the late Queen's Reign; as namely, to omit " others, by the two learned Doctors *Harding* " and *Stapleton*, in their Books againſt Mr. *Jewell* " and Mr. *Horne*, whom they preſſed mightily " with the Defect of due Vocation and Conſecra- " tion, urging them to prove the ſame, and to " ſhew how and by whom they were made Prieſts " and Biſhops—— And what trow you was an- " ſwered thereto? Was there any Biſhop named " who conſecrated them? Were there any Wit- " neſſes alledged of their Conſecration? Was " Mr. *Maſon*'s Regiſter or any other authentick " Proof thereof produced by Mr. *Jewell* or Mr. " *Horne?* No truly." The Author of the *Remarks* upon F. *Le Courayer* [d] tranſcribes this Paſſage and a great deal more that follows; and *Le Quien* [e] tranſlates this Part, as he has it from Mr. *Ward*. But they may both of them be deſired to anſwer this Queſtion. Pray what was this *Exception* of the *Prefacer* to the *Diſcuſſion*, and *Fitz-*

[c] Appendix to his Adjoinder to the Supplement to Parſons's Diſcuſſion, p 486. [d] P. 101, 102, 103. [e] T. 1. p. 245.

herbert,

herbert, againſt the Conſecration of our firſt Biſhops? Was it not, that they were conſecrated not at *Lambeth* but at the *Nag's-Head?* And can either of them have the Face to tell us, that this was expreſly the *old Quarrel vehemently urged and preſſed mightily*, againſt our Biſhops *Jewell* and *Horne*, by their Adverſaries *Harding* and *Stapleton?* Is there a Word to be found in either of theſe two Popiſh Writers, about the Ordination of our Biſhops at that Tavern? Does either of them ſo much as covertly give *Jewell* or *Horne* an Occaſion to remember their ſcandalous Way of being made Biſhops, by ſuch a ſly and dark Inſinuation as this, *Novimus & qui Te—— & quo Sacello. It is not unknown to us who ordained you—— and in what Chapel.* No, there is nothing like it, of Jeſt or Earneſt, to be found in either of thoſe two Writers. But the Jeſuit ſays, they were *preſſed mightily* by *Harding* and *Stapleton* with *the Defect of due Vocation and Conſecration*; and urged *to ſhew by whom and how they were made Biſhops*; and made no *Anſwer*, *by naming the Biſhops*, or *alledging Witneſſes*, or *producing the Regiſter or any other authentical Proof.* Here again *Le Quien* and the *Remarker* may be aſked, Do they not believe that thoſe two Catholick Doctors were ſatisfied that the Proteſtant Prelates *Jewell*, *Horne*, and *Parker*, could not be conſecrated by ſuch Perſons as were true and lawful Biſhops, nor by a Form ſufficient to confer the Order, or allowed of by the Canons of the Church, or the Laws of the Realm? If they believe that *Harding* and *Stapleton* were ſo perſuaded, does it not follow that they had ſufficient Grounds to charge our Biſhops with the Want of due Vocation and Conſecration, even tho' they were ordained at *Lambeth* as the Regiſter relates; without ever having the leaſt Thought of the *Exception* of *Parſons*'s *Prefacer* and *Fitzherbert*, that they had no Conſecration but at the *Nag's-Head?*

Head? For the Queſtions put by them, *How and by whom* Jewell *and* Horne *were made Biſhops*; do they neceſſarily imply, that they believed them to be ordained only by *Scory*, and by the Ceremony which he uſed at the Tavern? Or may they not be underſtood to imply, that the Perſons that laid Hands upon them at *Lambeth* were looked upon by *Harding* and *Stapleton* to be no Biſhops, and King *Edward*'s Form that was uſed there to be of no Validity or Authority? If this might be the Meaning of thoſe Queſtions, to what Purpoſe would it have been to make Anſwer, by naming the Biſhops who laid Hands upon them, when it would have been replied immediately that they were no true or lawful Biſhops? Or by producing Witneſſes, or ſhewing the Regiſter, to prove they were made Biſhops by ſuch Perſons and ſuch a Form, when theſe *Writers* muſt be ready to reply, that neither thoſe Perſons nor that Form could be ſufficient to confer upon them the Epiſcopal Order? So we ſee that *Fitzherbert*'s Pretence, that the old Quarrel of *Harding* and *Stapleton* againſt *Jewell* and *Horne*, about their Want of due Vocation and Conſecration, is the ſame with the new Exception of *Parſons*'s *Prefacer* and himſelf, about their being conſecrated at the Tavern, is nothing but Trick and Artifice, to give their *Fable* an Appearance of an earlier Date and greater Authority.

The following Writers however are glad to take the ſame Way of recommending their Relations of the Story. *Fitz-Simon* the next Year, in his ſecond Liſt of Authors (from whom he ſays we have the Story, not in expreſs Words but by neceſſary Conſequence) ſets down [f] *Briſtow*, *Harding*, *Stapleton*, *Reynolds*, and the *Rhemiſts*, and refers to ſome Places in the Margin where we may

[f] P. 317.

make

make the Diſcovery in thoſe Writers. *Champney* [g] after him gives us ſeveral Paſſages in *Stapleton* and others of thoſe Authors; beſides his long Account before of the [h] Diſpute between *Harding* and *Jewell*; and from him forty Years after (for which time Mr. *Maſon* had laid both the old and new Quarrel aſleep) we have them again in the [i] *Treatiſe of Catholick Faith and Hereſy*; and upon no better Foundation than this, the ſame Author, in his Book of the [k] *Nullity of the Prelatick Clergy*, affirms, as I obſerved before, that *it had been heard, credited, and related by the Wiſe and Sober Catholicks, for a Century before the time when he writ.* But the Honour was reſerved to *Le Quien* to make a more thorough Search into *Stapleton*, *Harding*, *&c.* in order [l] *to take off the frivolous Diſtinctions* made uſe of by our *Writers* (he means Mr. *Maſon* and Biſhop *Bramhall*) *to elude the Force of* thoſe *one or two Paſſages quoted before by the Catholicks*; and to overwhelm us with a Cloud of Teſtimonies, unanſwerably proving that this was the Point of Diſpute between thoſe two *Writers* on one Side, and *Jewell* and *Horne* on the other; and what eſcaped *Le Quien*'s Diligence and Induſtry is made up by ſome Gleanings in the Author of the *Remarks*. But they are both unhappy in thinking that this would be of ſo great Service to them: For the more theſe Writers ſay againſt our Orders, the more frequently and poſitively they charge our Biſhops with the Want of Conſecration, without ever offering to ſpeak a Word of the Fact which they are pretended to be ſo well acquainted with, notwithſtanding ſo many Opportunities they had of ſpeaking out, and the Senſe they muſt have that but telling the Story would ſave them ſo much farther Trouble,

[g] P. 472, &c. [h] à pag. 458. ad p. 467. [i] P. 14, 15.
[k] P. 75. ſup. p. 115. [l] T. 1. p. 282.

and

and put an End to the Diſpute at once; their Silence upon ſo many Occaſions that called upon them to *cry aloud and ſpare not*, is a ſufficient Proof that they had no ſuch thing to proclaim to the World, as well as their omitting nothing elſe of Scandal, that came in their Way to reproach our Biſhops with. The particular Paſſages, when we come to conſider them, will abundantly ſatisfy the Reader, that no Men in their Wits, that ſay ſo much as they do, would forbear ſaying any thing ſo much more material, if they had it to ſay: And this I ſhall proceed to ſhew; and becauſe *Le Quien* gives the firſt Place to *Stapleton* before *Harding*, I ſhall begin firſt with the younger, tho' not the leſs forward *Writer*.

Stapleton's *Readineſs to vent any Scandal againſt the* Reformers, *ſhews he could not have forborne to lay this Fact to their Charge, if he had known of it.*

3. To let the Reader into ſo much of *Stapleton*'s Character, as may ſatisfy him how well qualified and diſpoſed he was to have been a Trumpeter of the *Nag's-Head* Ordination, if it had ever come to his Ears, I need only point out to him one Paſſage in his Works, where he gives us more Proofs than one or two, of his Readineſs to lay hold upon any Opportunity of blackening the *Reformers*. It is in his *Promptuarium Catholicum* upon the Goſpel for the Sabbath in the third Week in *Lent*, where a Note of *Calvin*'s upon the Place (*John* viii. 7.) reflecting upon the ſhameleſs Incontinency of the Popiſh Clergy, gives him an Handle to ſhew his Reſentment in a very outrageous Manner, againſt *Calvin* himſelf, *Beza*, and *Luther*, and in like manner againſt the whole Body of the *Engliſh* Biſhops and Clergy. To *Calvin*'s and *Beza*'s Charge he lays [m] no leſs a Crime than the deteſtable Sin of Sodomy; and for *Calvin* he aſſures us, that both his Conviction of that

[m] Promptuarium Catholicum in Evangelia Ferialia Quadrageſimæ Sabbato Hebdom. 3. Op. T. 4. p. 749, 750, 751.

Crime, and his Puniſhment for it, (his being branded in the Back, and then baniſhed the Kingdom of *France*) ſtand upon Record in the publick Acts of the City of *Noyon*. Could we imagine that the *ſage and judicious Stapleton* (for that is the Epithet with which *Le Quien* adorns his Name, almoſt on every Occaſion, after Biſhop *Bramhall* had, as he thought, given him ſo good Authority for it, by owning, as *Le Quien* [n] takes care to publiſh, that *he was one of the moſt rational Heads of their Church*) ſhould, without either conſulting the Records and Regiſters at *Noyon*, or informing himſelf of the Certainty by ſome of his Correſpondents in *France*, venture to print a Report of ſuch a plain Falſhood and baſe Calumny? for that ſuch it was, manifeſtly appears from two of their own Writers, [o] Monſ. *Deſmay*, in his Book entitled *Remarks on the Life of* Calvin, *taken from the Regiſters of* Noyon, *the Place of his Birth*; and [p] Monſ. *Vaſſeur*, in his *Annals of the Cathedral Church of* Noyon: Both which Authors profeſſedly give an Account of *Calvin*'s Life, from what they could find in the Regiſters at *Noyon*, or any other Memoirs, or could hear from the Mouths of Perſons of a competent Age to give them Information, ſuch as had converſed with others that knew *Calvin:* Yet [q] both of them diſown their finding any Report of this Scandal, tho' they are both Papiſts, and declare they intend not to ſpare *Calvin*, and ſhew that they had no ſuch Intention by ſeveral things which they relate to his Prejudice, that are proved by Monſ. *Drelincourt* to be falſe and groundleſs. But *Stapleton* is not content with this Story, but follows *Calvin* from *Noyon* to *Geneva*, and tells us that the ſame *Reformer* kept an *Adonis* in his Houſe there, and when the young *Catamite*

[n] T. 1. p. 260. [o] La Defence de Calvin par C. Drelincourt. à p. 155. ad p. 191. [p] Ibid. à p. 191. ad p. 221.
[q] Ib. p. 210, 211, 222, 223, 224.

had

had robbed him and run away, he was fain to ſit down with the Loſs, rather than endeavour to apprehend and proſecute him, for fear of bringing their abominable Converſation to light. For this ſecond Tale, *Stapleton* refers in the Margin to an Author, but it is no other but the very infamous *Hierome Bolſeck*, from whom no queſtion he had greedily ſwallowed the former Story; tho' he vouches no Author, but confidently bids any one look into the Records at *Noyon* (where the Account was to be read at the time when he writ) to find that *Calvin* was convicted of *Sodomy* there, and ſuffered a leſſer Puniſhment for it than he deſerved, by the Biſhop and Magiſtrates ſparing his Life, and only branding him firſt, and then ſending him into Baniſhment; and to compleat the Story, and make it appear the more credible, he adds, that Perſons of great Worth that were his Relations had made uſe of all the Intereſt they had to get this Monument of his Infamy, ſo great a Blot upon the Family, eraſed out of the publick Records, but could not as yet obtain that Favour from the Magiſtrates. For *Beza*, to prove him to be guilty of the ſame Crime, he has no Fact or Voucher to produce, but ſets down at length an *Epigram* of his, writ when he was young, and a Member of their Church; wherein *Beza*, to copy (in that which did by no means become him) thoſe Authors whom his Genius to that Sort of Poetry led him to imitate, *Catullus* and *Martial*, takes a Liberty, in Expreſſions very looſe (and ſcandalous if ſtrictly interpreted) to perſonate a Man divided in his Amours between his *Candida* and his *Andebert*. This, and one or two other Pieces of his Poetry, *Stapleton* very charitably concludes to be ſufficient to ground upon them a Character of *Beza*, as a *profeſſed Sodomite*, as an *impure Wretch who had polluted himſelf with all the moſt horrid Kinds of Lewdneſs:* Tho' (beſides

that he very early declared in Print his real Senſe of that great Fault, in allowing ſuch a Liberty to his Pen, tho' his Life was chaſte) he had largely purged and vindicated himſelf, and defied his Adverſaries to lay any thing worſe than thoſe Verſes to his Charge, in an Epiſtle prefixed to an Edition of his other Poems, *Ann.* 1569. thirty Years almoſt before *Stapleton* writ this Part of his *Promptuarium*; a time certainly long enough for him to have made ſuch Enquiry as would have obliged him (if he could have any Charity for an Arch-Heretick) to have acquitted *Beza* of that falſe Scandal. After theſe Foreigners, he muſt not forget his own Country, but proceeds to as vile a Repreſentation of the whole Clergy of the Church of *England*, whom he declares *Maſters and Miniſters*, that is, both the Biſhops and inferior Clergy, to be *guilty, notwithſtanding their being allowed the married State, of ſuch filthy and impudent Lewdneſs that there can be nothing more impure than that married Anti-Clergy*, as he calls them. And what Authority does he bring to make good this Charge? No other than *one*, as he ſays, *of their own Number*; and the Reader may wonder to find it, in the Margin, to be *Martin Mar-Prelate*; whom *Stapleton* was ſo well acquainted with the State of our Affairs, as to take to be one ſingle Perſon, and a Member of the Church of *England*, inſtead of knowing that it was a Name, like that of *Legion*, for a [r] Combination of deſperate Libellers, whoſe Cauſe at that time obliged them to ſtick at nothing of Falſhood and Calumny, that might render the Biſhops and the Clergy (who adhered to them, and to the Conſtitution of the Eſtabliſhed Church) contemptible and odious. Such Writers, and *Bolſeck*, are a fit Match for one another, and proper Vouchers for

[r] Strype's Life of Whitgift, B. 2. c. 21.

Stapleton's Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory. It is well for the Reader that he ſays no more here, but only refers him to an Author then newly publiſhed for the like Character of *Martin Luther*. Theſe Inſtances of *Stapleton*'s Spirit will carry a much worſe Appearance, from this Part of his Works wherein we find them, a Book deſigned for the Inſtruction of the Catholick Preachers, and a Store-houſe to ſupply them with Matter in their Sermons to confute and expoſe the Hereticks of that time, that is, the Proteſtants: And theſe Accounts of the Wickedneſs of the *Engliſh* Clergy, and of the Leaders of the Reformation in the other Proteſtant Churches, equally groundleſs and malicious, he puts into the Mouths of their Preachers for an annual Entertainment of their Audience in every Church of that Communion, upon a certain Day in the holy Seaſon of *Lent*, as often as the Day ſhould return, and the Goſpel of the Day put them in mind of it. The Reader muſt not yet be ſurprized to find that the Publication of all this in his *Promptuarium* was not enough to content the Author, but he thought it proper to be re-printed every Word, before the End of the ſame Year, in his *Antidotum in Evangelia* [f], upon the ſame Place in St. *John*'s Goſpel. The very Title of this Work might have put him in mind of what he had forgot in the *Promptuarium*, to ſay ſomething in Defence of their injured Churchmen, againſt the venomous Reflections of *Calvin*, *Beza*, *&c.* but there is not a Word more here, and we have nothing there of that Nature; only, *Stapleton* ſays of *Beza*, *The impure Wretch, when he had polluted himſelf by all the moſt horrid kinds of Lewdneſs, takes a Meaſure of other Perſons by himſelf, and caſts the Scandal of the like Acts of Filthineſs upon all the Lovers of Chaſtity*;

[f] Op. Tom. 3. p. 236, 237.

and ſuch he is willing the Readers ſhould take thoſe Men to be, whom he would repreſent to the Party as baſely injured in their Characters by the vile Slanders of *Beza* and *Calvin*. And with the ſame Intent he proceeds to draw a Parallel between their Clergy's ſuffering under theſe Calumnies of the Proteſtants, and the like Treatment which the *Fathers* of the Church formerly met with, *Euſtathius*, St. *Chryſoſtom*, *&c.* and more particularly St. *Athanaſius*, whoſe Adverſaries ſuborned a Strumpet to accuſe him of a criminal Converſation with her, which was very happily proved to be falſe: And it would have been as happy if the Author could have diſproved thoſe notorious Inſtances of the Lewdneſs of their Popes and Clergy, recorded by their own Writers, which were a very juſt Ground for all the Reproaches of their Enemies. But he knew it was better to ſeem to vindicate them by ſuch dark Inſinuations, and to turn the Eyes of his Readers the contrary Way, by laying before them his ſcandalous Hiſtory of the *Reformers*.

Both theſe Parts of *Stapleton*'s Works, this Part of his *Promptuarium*, and his *Antidote* upon the Goſpels, were printed *Ann.* 1594. thirty Years almoſt after he had entered the Liſts againſt our Reformed Church and Biſhops, in his *Fortreſs of Faith*, *Ann.* 1565. Then he was young, in the Heat of Blood, his Head warm, and his Paſſions ſtrong; but in ſo long time after, it muſt be ſuppoſed that his Heat and Malice might have received ſome Degree of Allay and Abatement, by his being ſo far advanced in Years. We ſee, notwithſtanding, he could, when he was at the Age of threeſcore, be forward to caſt ſuch a Scandal upon *Calvin*'s Memory, who had then been more than thirty Years in his Grave, without any Warrant or Aſſurance of the Truth of thoſe Stories which he tells of him; and to blacken *Beza* in the

the ſame manner, tho' there was ſo very little Ground for it, as it might very eaſily have appeared to him; and to give ſuch a very foul Character of the *Engliſh* Biſhops and Clergy, upon no better Foundation than the Authority of *Martin Mar-Prelate.* And can we ſuppoſe that when he was ſo much younger, thirty Years before, he could at that time, and as often afterwards as the Subject of his Writings preſented him with a fair and proper Occaſion, have forborne to charge the heretical Bench of Biſhops in *England* with a Fact as wicked and deteſtable as any that he lays afterwards either to theirs or to *Calvin*'s or *Beza*'s Charge? a Fact which he muſt have known, as they pretend, within a little time after it was done, and with the greateſt Certainty, as he muſt have been informed of it either by the grand Eyewitneſs himſelf, or by others who had the Relation from his Mouth. Juſt before he printed his *Fortreſs of Faith*, he had, in his [t] Diſcourſe at the End of his Tranſlation of *Staphylus*'s Apology, taken upon him to call *Grindall* a *Pretended Prelate*; and preſently after, in his *Fortreſs*, and his *Return of Untruths to* Jewell, and his *Counterblaſt to* Horne, he had declared them and all their *Fellows* to be *No Biſhops*, and offered ſuch Arguments as he thought ſufficient to prove them to be none; and in the very Entrance of his Diſpute with *Horne* would not (as he lets him know) vouchſafe (as Abbot *Fecknam* had) to give him the Honour of ſo much as the very Name of *Biſhop of Wincheſter.* And could he, being of ſuch a Temper as has been ſhewed, and having been fully acquainted with the ſcandalous Manner of their pretended Conſecration, have let ſlip ſo many Opportunities of proclaiming his Knowledge of that Fact, and making the whole World ring with

[t] P. 162.

the Story of that profane Piece of Mockery? 'Tis natural to expect that in the former Part of his *Promptuarium Catholicum*, printed *Ann.* 1588. (a *Repertory* or Index of Common Places for their Preachers to declaim upon againſt the Hereticks, upon the *Sundays* and the *Feaſts* in the whole Year) he could not miſs of inſtructing them more than once, how they might inform their Hearers of the Want of Ordination in the Reformed Churches: And this accordingly we find he ſuggeſts to them as a proper Subject for their Diſcourſes upon the Texts that offer themſelves in the Goſpels [v] for St. *Andrew*'s and St. *Mark*'s Day, and *Tueſday* after *Pentecoſt*; and we have a Repetition in thoſe Places of almoſt every thing that he had ſaid in his former Writings upon that Argument; but there is not a Word here neither of the Hiſtory how the firſt *Engliſh* Proteſtant Biſhops were made, tho' that would have done the Buſineſs effectually, and ſaved the Trouble of all the reſt, as well as have been more convincing, and more ſuitable to the Capacities of a popular Audience, ſuch as this and the Stories of *Calvin*, *&c.* were deſigned for. Such an Account of our Biſhops making their Way to the higheſt Order in the Church, by a moſt profane and ſacrilegious Mockery of all that is ſacred, as is laid open in the *Nag's-Head* Story, would have juſtified that Character wherewith the inveterate Rancour and Bitterneſs of his Spirit prompts him to brand thoſe Biſhops, at the Concluſion of his Inſtructions to the Preachers, from the Goſpel for St. *Mark*'s Day, *That they were* Monſters *of thoſe Times, and* Plagues *of the Church, againſt whom the People ought to be exhorted to pray earneſtly to God and Chriſt, that they would* exterminate *thoſe profane Perſons and Strangers, thoſe Wolves and Robbers,*

[v] Op. T. 4. p. 820, 852, 866.

and

and ſet lawful Governours over the Church. A *Prayer* ſuitable to the Juncture of Time when *Stapleton* was writing this Work, about the Year 1588. when the Strength of the Popiſh Party were almoſt ready to put in Execution their Deſign of a formidable Invaſion upon *England*, in order to root out the Proteſtant Clergy and Church of this Nation; which was attempted in that Year with full Aſſurance of Succeſs; but, as ſoon as attempted, miraculouſly defeated by the gracious Hand of an Over-ruling Providence interpoſing in our Defence, about the time that his charitable Inſtructions to the Preachers againſt the Proteſtants were made publick.

4. This may be enough for the preſent, to ſhew how inconſiſtent it was with *Stapleton*'s Temper and Spirit, to have concealed the Fact of the Tavern-Ordination, if he had ever been informed of it. We may now enter upon the Examination of the particular Paſſages alledged by *Le Quien* and the *Remarker*, or elſewhere to be found in that voluminous Writer, wherein he may be pretended to be a Witneſs, againſt the Account of the Conſecration of our Biſhops in the *Lambeth* Regiſter, and for the Story of the *Nag's-Head* Ordination. His firſt Work, where he ſpeaks of their Ordinations, is the *Fortreſs of Faith*, printed *Ann.* 1565. of which, and the *Counterblaſt to* Horne, *Ann.* 1567. and the *Return of Untruths to* Jewell, *Ann.* 1566. I am to acquaint the Reader, that the Author himſelf writ them in *Engliſh*, but did not tranſlate them himſelf into *Latin*, or give Authority by his Approbation to any Tranſlation made of them during his Life by any other Perſons; but the *Paris* Edition of his Works in *Latin*, more than twenty Years after his Deceaſe, informs us, in the *Preface* of the Publiſhers to the firſt Tome, and in other Places in the ſecond,

that thoſe *Engliſh* Pieces were tranſlated by ſome Divines of the *Engliſh* Nation employed by the Editors, and not publiſhed in *Latin* till then. And this is a ſufficient Caution to us, and ſhould have been to *Le Quien*, as we ſhall ſee afterwards, to compare the Tranſlations with the Original, and not haſtily to give Credit to what the Tranſlators ſay, without good Warrant for it. To enable us more clearly and diſtinctly to determine the Senſe of the Author in the ſeveral Places of his *Fortreſs*, and the reſt of his Works, in *Engliſh* or *Latin*, we have the Point of Diſpute ſtated by *Le Quien* himſelf, what he is ready to maintain to be *Stapleton*'s declared Judgment of the Ordinations of our firſt Biſhops. It was, as the *Father* gives us to underſtand, [w] *the eſſential and capital Point of Controverſy between the Catholick Doctors and ours for fifty Years* (he means from the time of *Parker*'s Conſecration) *to call in queſtion our Biſhops having been at all conſecrated or ordained. Not to diſpute whether the Ordinations they received were valid or invalid*—— *but to diſpute their having been ordained at all, in any manner whatſoever.* Whether this is true of *Stapleton*, is to be determined upon a Survey of the Parts of his Works. In the *Fortreſs of Faith*, *Part* 2. *ch.* 8. he propoſes to ſhew the different Manner of *Auguſtine* the Monk, and the Biſhops conſecrated by him, coming into the Epiſcopal Order, from that of the firſt Proteſtant Biſhops in Queen *Elizabeth*'s Reign. *Auſtin*, he ſays, went over into *France*, and was there conſecrated at *Arles* the firſt Arch-Biſhop of *Canterbury*, by ſeveral Biſhops, according to Pope *Gregory*'s Command. And when he was come back, being now Arch-Biſhop of *Canterbury*, he ordained *Mellitus* Biſhop of *London*, and *Juſtus* Biſhop of *Rocheſter*. But for our Biſhops, his

[w] T. 1. p. 246.

Words follow, " Now the Pretended Biſhops of " Proteſtants, whereas the whole Number of our " Learned and Reverend Paſtors (our Lord be " praiſed) for Confeſſion of the Truth were diſ- " placed of their Rooms, none being left in the " Realm having Authority to conſecrate Biſhops " or to make Prieſts, (that being the Office of " only Biſhops) by what Authority do they go- " vern the Fold of Chriſt's Flock? Who laid " Hands over them as St. *Paul* expreſly did unto " *Timothy* and *Titus*, when he made them Biſhops? " Whither went they to be conſecrated, into " *France*, *Spain*, or *Germany*, ſeeing that at home " there was no Number of ſuch as might and " would ſerve their Turn? No, no, as their Re- " ligion is contrary, their End is diverſe, their " Beginning hath been utterly different from the " true Chriſtian Faith planted, ſo are their Pro- " ceedings different and repugnant. They have " not come in by the Door, they have ſtolen in " like Thieves, without all ſpiritual Authority " or Government." Here, in the [x] firſt Step that he takes (*Whereas the whole Number, &c.*) is not *Stapleton* ſo unhappy that his Account is plainly falſe in Matter of Fact? For is it true that their *whole Number of Biſhops were diſplaced of their Rooms?* as he tells us with ſo great Satiſfaction, as to look up to Heaven and give God Thanks for the unanimous Adherence of their Paſtors to the Confeſſion of the Truth for which they ſuffered Deprivation. Is it true alſo that *there was none left in the Realm having Authority to conſecrate Biſhops?* Does not *Harding*, very ſoon after, ſhew that this young Champion for the Cauſe was too forward in his Reckoning? Does he not ſay that of the Number of their Paſtors there

His firſt Objection againſt the Ordination of our Biſhops, proves that he was utterly ignorant of their being ordained at the Nag's-Head.

[x] Fortreſs of Faith, Edition of St. Omers, 8vo. 1625. p. 367.

was

was [y] *one that was made to break Unity?* It is true, he calls that one a Fool for his pains, in the Words that he puts into the Mouth of a Catholick Biſhop ſpeaking to a Proteſtant Peer, *We had but one Fool among us, and him you have gotten unto you.* But what he ſays might inform his *Intimate and Correſpondent in their Controverſial Labours* (as the *Remarker* [z] ſays *Stapleton* was to *Harding*) that there was *one* who eſcaped being *diſplaced of his Room*, by denying that Truth for which the others had the Honour, both in his and *Harding*'s Opinion, to be Confeſſors. But if he had ſeen this in *Harding*, or in [a] *Fulk*'s Anſwer to his *Fortreſs*, who tells him what he ſays is *utterly falſe, for there was one of the Popiſh Biſhops that continued in his Place*; he had time to forget it in twenty Years after, *Ann.* 1588. when we find the ſame thing as crudely aſſerted in the *Promptuarium*, where he ſays of our *falſe Biſhops* (as he calls them) [b] *Veris Epiſcopis ad* unum omnibus *ejectis & in vincula conjectis, a nemine manus impoſitionem accipiebant*; and again, *Triplicat. adv. Whitakerum, An.* 1596. [c] *Pulſis* univerſis *Catholicis Epiſcopis—— intruſi ſunt alii ſine ullâ manuum impoſitione, &c.* His being ſtill for ſo long time in the ſame Miſtake is the more unaccountable, becauſe before his *Promptuarium Catholicum* was printed, *Sanders*'s Book *De Schiſmate Anglicano*, had two Editions, if not a third; and his Words, when he ſpeaks of the Deprivation of the Popiſh Biſhops, are, (not *ad unum omnes*, but) [d] Præter unum *omnes de gradu & dignitate ſuâ depoſiti ſunt.* So that *Stapleton* might have been advertiſed of his former Error the third time by that Hiſtorian, as well as

[y] Confut. of the Apology, Part 6. c. 2. [z] P. 69.
[a] Fortreſs of Stapleton overthrown, p. 113.
[b] Prompt. Cath. ſuper Evangelia in Feſtis in die S. Marci. Op. T. 4. p. 853. [c] Op. T. 1. p. 1259.
[d] Sanderus de Schiſm. Angl. l. 3. p. 286. Ed. Ingolſtad.

ſhewed

ſhewed by him how to correct it. The *Remarker*, who tranſcribes this and ſo much more from the *Promptuarium*, was not prepared to find any Miſtake in his Author, neither there nor in the *Fortreſs of Faith* in *Engliſh* or *Latin*; nor had taken notice of *Fulk*'s reproaching *Stapleton* with it, or of *Harding* and *Sanders*'s laying it before his Eyes, if he ever read them. If he had obſerved this, it would have happily prevented another Obſervation (which he took then to be very judicious, but may now think otherwiſe of it) from *Stapleton*'s denying the Ordination of our Biſhops, [e] *not only in the Books he writ ſoon after the pretended Fact, but alſo in thoſe he publiſhed thirty Years after*; that *it ſhews that neither Friend nor Enemy had convinced him, nor even minded him of any Miſtake, or of any thing worſe than a Miſtake, in ſo notorious a Matter.* He ſees here a very groſs *Miſtake* of his, in *a Matter* equally *notorious*, the Deprivation of the Popiſh Biſhops, not only in a *Book writ ſoon after the Fact*, but in another *thirty, and a third forty Years after*, tho' it is almoſt impoſſible, but that he muſt have been both *minded and convinced* of it, at leaſt by his *Adverſary* that reproached him with it to his Face; if not by his *two particular Friends.* There might be good Reaſon for the *Tranſlator* of the *Fortreſs*, tho' he ſaw the Error of his Author, and might wiſh he had not ſhewed himſelf to be ſo much miſtaken, yet to render the *Engliſh* faithfully, as he does in the *Propugnaculum Fidei*, [f] *Doctiſſimi & Reverendiſſimi Epiſcopi noſtrates Catholici*—— omnes ad unum *ſedibus Epiſcopalibus ob veritatis confeſſionem pulſi ſunt:* And we muſt not entertain that Opinion either of *Stapleton* in his *Promptuarium*, or of his *Tranſlator* in the *Propugnaculum Fidei*, that they were no better *Latiniſts* than to mean, by

[e] P. 73. [f] Op. T. 2. p. 799.

ad

ad unum omnes, all but one; tho' it ought to be ſo, if in Reality that was truly *the whole Number.*

But I would aſk who was that *one*, who was not diſplaced together with the reſt? Was it not *Kitchin* of *Landaff?* Is it poſſible then that *Stapleton* ſhould have been fully informed of the *Nag's-Head* Ordination, and yet be ignorant that this was the Man that, after he had ſaved his Biſhoprick by taking the Oath of Supremacy, complied ſo much farther as to give the Biſhops elect a Meeting in order to be their Conſecrator, but declining it at the Place of Action, left them to get themſelves ordained by *Scory?* Is it poſſible that he ſhould ſay that *all their Biſhops to a Man* were deprived of their Sees, and *none left having Authority to conſecrate a Biſhop*, and yet know that there was one of them that kept his Poſt, and his Authority to inveſt others with the Order, and had like, if his Courage had not failed him, to have given the Proteſtants a Caſt of his Office, and to have ordained Arch-Biſhop *Parker* and no fewer than fourteen other Biſhops at one *Merry-Meeting?* Muſt not this Writer, if he had been for ſo long time fully informed of that Meeting, and the Part that *Landaff* did act, and was farther to have acted there, have recollected himſelf preſently after he had ſaid *the whole Number*, and owned there was one Exception of a *Paſtor* of theirs that *was not diſplaced?* as *Fitz-Simon* [g] does, after he had ſaid that *there were not three, nor two, nor one Biſhop, that could and would conſecrate the others.* —*I ſaid*, ſays he, *there was not one*—— *but I was not ignorant that one only*, Kitchin *of* Landaff—— *went over to the Reformers.* I ſee no Expedient to qualify theſe Expreſſions of *Stapleton's*; they are full and plain, *the whole Number*

[g] Supp. p. 12.

of

of their Paſtors, Univerſi *Catholici Epiſcopi*, every one of the Catholick Biſhops, *Veri Epiſcopi* ad unum omnes, all the true Biſhops to a Man; and, in conſequence of their Deprivation, *none being left in the Realm having Epiſcopal Authority.* And beſides, he ſpeaks in the *Fortreſs* with a Shew of Religion, and bleſſes God that the whole Number of their Prelates were unanimous in their Reſolution to ſuffer for the Truth; where he muſt be thought to appeal to God himſelf for a Witneſs of that, for which he praiſes his holy Name; and ſure he muſt be then in very good Earneſt. If it be pretended that he looked upon *Landaff* not to be one of the Number of their Biſhops, after his taking the Oath of the Queen's Supremacy, it is eaſy to ſee that this Pretence would juſtify his ſaying that the whole Number of their Biſhops were deprived, tho' two or three others beſides *Landaff* had complied, and ſaved their Biſhopricks. But ſuppoſe him at that time not to be arrived to the Age of the *Judicious Stapleton*, but, as a young Writer, raſh and inconſiderate, and led thereby into a Miſtake; ſtill this Miſtake about *Landaff*, as if he had been deprived together with the reſt, is inconſiſtent with his having any Knowledge or Remembrance of that Biſhop's having kept his Poſt, and qualified himſelf to be the Conſecrator of our Biſhops at the *Nag's-Head:* for if he knew it, it was not poſſible for him to ſay that all their Biſhops to a Man were diſplaced. So our very Entrance upon *Stapleton* ſets us farther off than we were before, from allowing him to be a Witneſs of the Truth of that Fable.

5. Let us ſee if in the reſt that he ſays we ſhall meet with better Satisfaction. Upon their Biſhops being all deprived, and there being not one left with Power to conſecrate any others, he aſks,

aſks [h], How could our pretended Prelates come to have Epiſcopal Authority? Who laid Hands upon them as St. *Paul* did upon *Timothy* and *Titus?* Did they, having none at home, go over, as *Auſtin* the Monk did, into *France*, or into *Spain*, or *Germany*, to get themſelves conſecrated there by true Biſhops? Himſelf anſwers, *No, no.* Now could any one who had been told that the *Nag's-Head* Ordination was notoriouſly known in *Stapleton*'s time, and that frequently he had in effect reproached our Biſhops with it, expect to hear any thing elſe after this *No, no*, than to this Purpoſe, "No, they had not the Grace to ſubmit themſelves to be conſecrated by any true Biſhops, "at Home or Abroad, but went all of them together to a Tavern, with one of our *Apoſtate* "*Prieſts*, who there took upon him to ordain "them (*horreſco referens*) in a ſcandalous profane "Manner ſuitable to the Place?" This is the leaſt that could have been expected to follow here, if not the whole Story at length, then (as it is pretended) ſo freſh in *Stapleton*'s Memory: But inſtead of this, the effect of all that comes after is, *As their Principles are, ſo was their Practice; they came not in by the Door, but like Thieves and Robbers:* In what manner they came in, to deſerve to be branded with this Character, we are left in the dark, tho' we muſt believe his Head was full at that time of the *Tavern-Story*. A very proper Preface and Introduction this would have been, if the Hiſtory itſelf had then followed; but can we believe he could come thus far, and the Fact not ſtare him in the Face, and oblige him not to paſs it over? He had given his Reader, from *Bede*'s Hiſtory, an Account how their firſt Biſhops of the Church of *England* were ordained; and his Diſcourſe is not ſo much in a way of Argument

[h] Sup. p. 249.

as

as Hiſtory; and the End and Deſign of it is to ſhew the Difference between their firſt Biſhops and ours in this regard: Could he then, after he had particularly related how theirs were made, have paſſed ours over with a general Reflection, when he had the whole Proceeding and every Part of it before his Eyes? To ſay ſo much therefore as he does, and no more, muſt, if he had ſo much more to ſay, ſhew that either he was not awake, or not in his Wits; or his rational Head ſo weak as to give up that wherein the greateſt Strength of his Cauſe lay, by (to borrow once more the *Remarker*'s Words) *an unwarrantable Dumbneſs.* If an Evidence that came into Court to prove a *Felon* guilty of Robbery, ſhould tell them that the Priſoner at the Bar had been long known to him to be a Man of no Religion or Virtue, and that his Way of living was agreeable to his Principles; would not the Court, if he were breaking off without ſaying any thing more, tell him all this was Impertinence, except he could upon his Oath ſpeak home to the Fact for which the Priſoner ſtood indicted? So the *Evidence* we are here examining wanted *Neale* or ſome body elſe to whiſper in his Ear, and tell him, "Sir, you quite "forget the *Nag's-Head* Ordination."

6. Can we impute this Silence to ſome degree of Modeſty in him at this Age, and his not being then ſo much enraged againſt the Proteſtants as he was when he told the Stories of *Calvin*, *Beza*, *&c.* almoſt thirty Years after? 'Tis but looking back to his third Chapter of this ſecond Part[i], and we find him telling two Stories together, one of *Calvin*, equally ſcandalous, of an Attempt of his to make the World believe that he had raiſed a dead Man to Life, and the ſad Conſequence of

[i] P. 256, 257. Op. T. 2. p. 773.

it

it in the poor Man who was to counterfeit himſelf to be dead, to have that Miracle wrought upon him; and the other more entertaining and ridiculous, of *Luther*'s being prevailed upon with much ado to try to exorciſe a young Maid poſſeſſed with a Devil; and the Devil, inſtead of being caſt out of the Maid, tormenting the Prophet that ſhould have caſt him out, and having inviſibly barred the Door within and without, ſo that *Luther* in great Agony for a long time could not get out of the Hands of the evil Spirit (tho' he attempted it at the Window, but that too was barred) till *Staphylus* himſelf, from whom *Stapleton* relates the Story, delivered *Luther* and the Doctors of *Wittenberg*, and himſelf, then Maſter of Arts, and other Students of the Univerſity who were Spectators, by taking up a Hatchet thrown in at the Window, (not by the Devil we muſt preſume) and with all his Force and hard Labour at laſt getting the Door open. Does not *Stapleton* now appear to be of a Temper very likely to paſs over untouched, when he was juſt come to it, the Relation how our Biſhops were made, out of pure Modeſty, and Want of Inclination to caſt ſuch a Scandal upon them? But I needed not have ſent the Reader back to theſe Stories, if it were not to give him a little Diverſion. In this eighth Chapter which we are upon, within four or five Pages after that wherein he baulks our Expectations by this Omiſſion, there is evident Proof of his Diſpoſition to have done *Parker* and the reſt of our Biſhops all the Juſtice imaginable that lay in his Power. The Reader muſt know firſt, that the Arch-Biſhop and his Brethren found themſelves for ſome time under a Neceſſity of making ſome Laymen, that had not had learned Education, but were brought up to Trades, and ſome of them Mechanicks, Readers in ſome of the vacant Churches under their Care, and of admitting others

others of the like Condition into Deacon's or Prieſt's Orders, to ſerve thoſe Cures which could not ſoon be otherwiſe provided for. To ſhew him with how great Prudence and Circumſpection this was done, and how watchful they were to remedy any Inconveniencies that might attend it, I need only refer to *Strype* [k]. But if he reads a little farther in this Chapter of the *Fortreſs*, it will appear how well prepared *Stapleton* was to make a very odious Repreſentation of the Conduct of our Biſhops, and the State of our Clergy, upon this Occaſion. Our Prelates, [l] as *being no Biſhops at all*, he repreſents as looking upon themſelves to be under no Obligation to obſerve the Apoſtle's Rule to *Timothy*, of *laying Hands ſuddenly on no Man*; but haſtily admitting into Orders all Comers, *worthy or unworthy*, *Poticaries*, *Taylors*, *Sadlers*, *Ropers*, *Furriers*, *Cappers*, *and ſuch other of all Crafts and Occupations*, *ſo faſt and ſo thick*, that there was a want of Hands to work in the ſeveral Trades. This he makes Sport with, in an Anſwer (which he either makes or reports) of *a Worſhipful Gentleman* of their Communion *riding with one of the Pretended Biſhops*, *who aſked him merrily why his Saddle and Boots were ſo mean?* "My Lord (ſaid the Gentleman) *You* have taken "up all our Sadlers and Shoemakers and pro-"moted them to the Miniſtry, ſo that there is "ſcarce one left that will work for Money." The Relator thinks it not proper to omit, that his *Worſhip* rapped out two Oaths, at the Beginning, and before the Concluſion of this ſhort Speech; which were not to be ſpared in the Relation, that it might obtain the greater Credit. And could the ſame Man that makes ſo much of this Matter, and ſtrains ſo hard to ſet it in a falſe

[k] Annals, Vol. 1. p. 176, &c. 182, &c. 203, &c.
[l] P. 372. Op. T. 2. p. 800.

Light, and make it look with the worſt Appearance; that allows himſelf the Liberty to give ſuch a Turn to the conſcientious Care of Arch-Biſhop *Parker* and the other Biſhops, to provide for the Neceſſities of the Church as well as they could in that Exigence, (when otherwiſe ſo many Pariſhes muſt either have been left, as *Stapleton* would have had them, to thoſe blind Guides who would have led them into Error, Superſtition, and Idolatry, or elſe have never had the Service of the Church, or the Scriptures or Homilies read, or Sermons preached, or the Sacraments adminiſtred to them) as to make this Care of theirs to be their Crime, a ſcandalous Neglect of their Duty, and a Diſregard of the Apoſtle's Injunction to be circumſpect and cautious upon whom they laid their Hands; that, laſtly, could take ſo much Pleaſure in ſuch a Report, relate it in ſo particular a Manner, and make it the Subject of Sport and Merriment for the Entertainment of the Party: Can it be conceived that this Man ſhould have any Reſtraint upon him to keep him from laying open ſuch a Scene of Weakneſs and Folly, as well as Irreligion and Profaneneſs, as diſcovers itſelf in the Account of the Mock-Conſecration of theſe Biſhops, if it had been known to him for no leſs than four or five Years, or if he had been acquainted with it about the time when he was writing? I may leave it to any Reader, Proteſtant or Papiſt, to judge whether this can be looked upon as poſſible: And if it cannot, then let him tell me whether *Stapleton*'s never mentioning a Word of this Fact in this and all other Places of his Works where he has Occaſion to ſay any thing that might lead to it, is not an Evidence that it was an Invention of ſome of their working Heads in After-times, and never publickly heard of till he had been ſeveral Years in his Grave.

7. We

7. We may well conjecture it is not for nothing that *Le Quien* when he takes *Stapleton*'s *Propugnaculum Fidei* in hand, and had the very Place in *Latin* that I have produced from the *Fortreſs* in *Engliſh*, lying before him, ſets down no Part of it but the Concluſion, which follows within a Line or two after the End of what I have ſet down, [m] *Dico igitur, &c.* [n] *I ſay therefore, by the Verdict of Holy Scripture and Practice of the Primitive Church, theſe Men are no Biſhops.* For what Reaſon does the *Father* omit *Stapleton*'s Premiſſes, from whence he infers this Concluſion? May not one be apt to think that he was ſtartled, at the firſt Entrance, to find in his Author ſuch a Blunder, of *the whole Number of their Paſtors (the Lord be praiſed)* and conſequently *Landaff* (whoſe keeping his Biſhoprick laid the Foundation of the *Nag's-Head* Story) *being diſplaced of their Rooms?* and that he was not willing to lay it before us to put us in a Way to hit the Blot? eſpecially if it be conſidered that he himſelf [o] cites that Paſſage of *Fulk*, where he tells *Stapleton it is utterly falſe*, and makes great Uſe of ſome other Words in it. And may it not be thought that afterwards he could not but obſerve, that *Stapleton* a little before his Concluſion, at a Place where no Body could believe he could miſs falling upon the *Nag's-Head* Ordination, ſlips over it, and ſays no more but that our Biſhops *did not come in at the Door, but ſtole in like Thieves? Le Quien* muſt pardon me, if I do him the leaſt Wrong in this Surmiſe, having ſeen enough before of his artful Management to give me ſome Suſpicion.

[m] Op. T. 2. p. 796.
[n] Fortreſs, p. 368.
[o] T. 1. p. 274.

Stapleton *does not (as* Le Quien *pretends) deny that our Biſhops had any Impoſition of Hands at all, but only that they had Hands laid upon them by true Biſhops.*

8. But to come to the Uſe that he makes of his Author *Stapleton*'s Words in the Paſſage above, the Concluſion of which *Le Quien* gives us. For this, I muſt deſire the Reader to obſerve the Scope and Drift, and the main Ground of that Author's Charge againſt our Biſhops in this Paſſage. He affirms plainly, they had no Conſecration: But for what Reaſon? Becauſe they had no Biſhops to conſecrate them, all the Biſhops at Home, of the Church of *Rome*, being deprived, and they not applying themſelves to any Biſhops in *France* or elſewhere; as *Auſtin* the Monk did, by Pope *Gregory*'s Order. This, he ſays, left them without having *any Hands laid over them* by true Biſhops, as *Auſtin* had by the Biſhops in *France*, and *Mellitus* and *Juſtus* by *Auſtin*; and in the Beginning of Chriſtianity *Timothy* and *Titus* had by St. *Paul*. Let me aſk now, Does he object to our Biſhops abſolutely the Want of any Impoſition of Hands at all, or the Want of having Hands laid over them by true Biſhops? Is the Queſtion that he puts, Had they Hands laid over them by any Perſon? or, *Who laid Hands over them?* Theſe are two very different Queſtions; and the latter, it is plain, is the Queſtion in *Stapleton*'s Words [p]. Yet the Reader, if he is not aware, will find himſelf impoſed upon by F. *Le Quien*, as if it were only the firſt Queſtion; and made to believe that *Stapleton*'s Ground for declaring them to be no Biſhops was their not having (not Epiſcopal, but) any Impoſition of Hands at all. When *Le Quien* [q] is paſſing from his *Counterblaſt* to his *Fortreſs of Faith*, he tells us, that Stapleton *maintains every where that Queen* Elizabeth's *firſt Biſhops were not ordained by the Form preſcribed in King* Edward's *Ordinal*—— *but that they were inveſted in the Sees*

[p] Sup. p. 249. [q] P. 269, 270.

to

to which they were nominated without Solemnity, without Ceremony, thinking it enough that they had the Queen's Letters Patents. The Ordination, he ſays, *according to King* Edward's *Form, was to be performed by ſeveral Biſhops, and the Order to be conferred by Impoſition of Hands:* and *in the Acts of Conſecration which are produced, it appears there were Biſhops who with Solemnity and Ceremony laid their Hands upon thoſe whom they conſecrated Biſhops after their Manner. And yet* Stapleton *within four or five Years after theſe Ordinations, abſolutely denies that our Biſhops had any Impoſition of Hands, and* [r] *reproaches them publickly* upon that Account; which, he ſays, the *Rational Stapleton* could never have done *if they had been ordained by King* Edward's *Ordinal, with Impoſition of Hands:* And this is enough with F. *Le Quien* to prove that *Stapleton* declares that they were not conſecrated (as our lying Regiſter relates) by that Ordinal. But does not the rational F. *Le Quien* ſee here, that he is impoſing upon himſelf and his Readers by a poor Fallacy, (*à dicto ſecundum quid ad dictum ſimpliciter*, as *Logicians* call it) from that which his Author affirms in a certain particular Reſpect, to his affirming it abſolutely and in general without Limitation? from his ſaying that our Prelates had not the laying on of the Hands of *true Biſhops*, to his ſaying that they had no Impoſition of Hands *at all?* Juſt as if *Stapleton*, in the Paſſage above cited [s], had begun with the true Account, *That the whole Number of their Paſtors were deprived*, who refuſed to take the Oath of Supremacy; and *Le Quien* ſhould pretend to take it from him, and give it us in this manner, *That the whole Number of their Paſtors (abſolutely) were deprived.* 'Tis the very ſame ſort of Miſrepreſentation in both Places, their Biſhops being deprived, *all but one*, who

[r] P. 272. [s] Sup. p. 249.

took the Oath of Supremacy, and their being *all and every one of them* deprived; and our Biſhops not having Hands laid upon them *by true Biſhops*, and their not having Hands laid upon them *at all*; *i. e.* by any one, whether true Biſhop or not. If they had been ordained by the Form in King *Edward*'s Ordinal, but by ſuch Perſons as were no Biſhops at all, is it not plain that they would not have had the Impoſition of Biſhop's Hands? but is it not ſtill as plain that they would have had Hands laid upon them, tho' not by ſuch Perſons as were true Biſhops? All that *Stapleton* ſaid before, or proceeds to ſay after this, proves effectually, if it were not plain from his Words already, that he had no other Meaning. He commends *Auſtin* at the firſt, [t] that he would not *take the Honour* of an Arch-Biſhop *to himſelf without laying on of Hands of other Biſhops:* (This *Le Quien* [u] makes no more of than that *Stapleton* ſhews that *Auſtin was ordained Biſhop as St.* Paul *and* Barnabas, *by Impoſition of Hands*) And he proſecutes the Argument from [w] St. *Paul*'s being *ſent* (tho' an Apoſtle before) *to preach to the Gentiles by laying on of Hands of the Elders being gathered together*, who by the Holy Spirit's Command *ſeparated* him and *Barnabas* for that *Work*, by *Faſting and Prayer, and laying their Hands upon them.* The ſame he ſays *Paul* [x] himſelf *practiſed* in *Timothy* and *Titus*, and cites two Places of Scripture for it, which he himſelf renders in *Engliſh*, *Noli negligere, &c.* [y] *Deſpiſe not the Grace of God, which was given thee through Prophecy with* the laying on of Hands of Prieſthood; and *Admoneo te, &c.* [z] *I warn thee to ſtir up the Grace of God which is in thee*, by the laying on of my Hands. Which laſt Text he adds to ſhew that St. *Paul*

This proved from Stapleton's *Words in the Places alledged by* Le Quien *from the* Fortreſs, &c.

[t] P. 367. [u] T. 1. p. 270. [w] P. 368. [x] P. 369.
[y] 1 Tim. iv. 14. [z] 2 Tim. i. 6.

declares

declares that this laying on of Hands of Prieſthood *was his own doing*; and obſerves from the Words in both Texts [a] that the Scripture requires *an external Ceremony of laying on of Hands*; and that it teaches us beſides that *a Grace is given therewith*; *which two things*, he ſays, *make up the Sacrament of Holy Orders.* And he goes on to prove the ſame two things from the *Fathers*, the neceſſary Uſe of that external Ceremony, and that Grace is conferred by it. But will any one have the Confidence to ſay, that he means here by that Ceremony the laying on of Hands by any one that is not a true Biſhop, or that any other laying on of Hands confers the Grace that is given in Holy Orders? This were to give up the Ground of his Argument to prove our Prelates to be no Biſhops; that to lay Hands upon, or ordain a Biſhop or Prieſt [b] *is the Office of only Biſhops*, and our Prelates having no Biſhops to conſecrate them, in conſequence had not Hands laid over them as *Timothy* and *Titus* had by St. *Paul*, *when he made them Biſhops.* Beſides, *Stapleton*, in all the Places produced by Father *Le Quien* from this Section in his *Propugnaculum Fidei*, and in one Place more, which I do not find alledged by *Le Quien*, conſtantly keeps to the Expreſſion he had learned from St. *Paul* (not barely Impoſition of Hands, but) *Impoſition of the Hands of the Prieſthood.* After his Proofs from Scripture and the *Fathers*, for the neceſſary Uſe of the Ceremony of Impoſition of Hands, and that Grace is conferred by it, which two make up the Sacrament of Orders, he ſays, [c] *Now Proteſtants refuſe this Sacrament, deny ſuch Grace to be given, and do occupy the Rooms of Biſhops without laying on of Hands of the* Prieſthood. *Le Quien* [d] cites it from the

[a] P. 370. [b] Sup. p. 249. [c] Fortreſs, p. 371, 372.
[d] T. 1. p. 271. Staplet. Op. T. 2. p. 800.

Latin thus: "Proteſtantes autem hâc Sacramen-
"tum rejiciunt, & omnem talem gratiam negant,
"& Epiſcopales ſedes occupant SINE OMNI IM-
"POSITIONE MANUUM PRESBYTERII." The *Father* puts the laſt Words in great Letters, to make a Shew as if they were an unqueſtionable Proof of his declaring that our Biſhops had *no* Impoſition of Hands *at all:* yet the Word *Presbyterii* plainly ſhews he denies only their having Hands laid upon them by true Biſhops, whom in the Words of St. *Paul* to *Timothy*, cited by *Stapleton*, he, as well as the Apoſtle, muſt be underſtood to mean by the *Prieſthood*, or *Presbytery*.

Stapleton proceeds, after theſe Words, to reproach our Prelates, That [e] *they being no Biſhops at all, call to the holy Vocation— Poticaries— Taylors, Sadlers, &c.* and after enlarging upon this Scandal, which he caſts upon the *whole Corps* (as he expreſſes it) *of the pretended Clergy that then was*; his Words follow, *Theſe pretended Biſhops being unlawfully placed themſelves, without Authority from other, without laying on of Hands of the Prieſthood, as Scripture requires, their Doctrine hath no Authority, their Miniſters may return every one to their Occupations again, and live like honeſt Craftſmen, whereas they are now unlawful Miniſters.* We ſee here the Prieſts and Deacons, ordained by our Biſhops to officiate in the Churches, are commanded back by *Stapleton* to their *Shops* again, (from whence he ſaid before *they leapt into the Pulpit*) becauſe the Biſhops that ordained them had not themſelves the *laying on of Hands of the* Prieſthood. The Tranſlation of this Paſſage (as if there were nothing between) *Le Quien* claps cloſe to the former: [f] "Iſti ſuperintendentes ſine aliquâ legitimâ
"vocatione Sedes Epiſcopales invadentes, NEC

[e] Fortreſs, p. 372. Op. T. 2. p. 809. ſup. p. 257.
[f] T. 1. p. 271, 272.

"ULLAM

"ULLAM IMPOSITIONEM MANUUM PRESBY-
"TERII HABENTES, quam authoritatem meren-
"tur?" Here, notwithſtanding the *Father*'s Notice, by the Change of the Letters, that the Words are a Demonſtration to his Purpoſe, yet the Author, as we ſee plainly, denies not *all* Impoſition of Hands, but only that of *the Hands of the Prieſthood required in Scripture*; which *Le Quien* need not be told muſt be no other than the Hands of Biſhops.

That this is the Author's Meaning, himſelf puts out of Diſpute, by the Concluſion of his long and preſſing *Admonition* to the Miniſters that had been made by our Biſhops, (from *p.* 373. to *p.* 376.) [g] "Learn, that at the planting of our "Chriſtian Faith—— Biſhops of the Realm were "ordained by laying on of Hands required in "holy Scripture, by which Authority they made "other Prieſts and inferior Miniſters to ſerve in "the Church underneath them. Your pretended "Biſhops have no ſuch Ordination, no ſuch lay-"ing on of Hands of other Biſhops, no Au-"thority to make true Prieſts or Miniſters, "and therefore neither are ye true Miniſters, "neither they any Biſhops at all." This laſt Paſſage concludes that thirty firſt Section in the *Fortreſs*, relating to the Want of Conſecration in our Biſhops: And perhaps it is not cited by *Le Quien*, becauſe nothing can be more plain, than that by *the laying on of Hands required in Scripture*, *Stapleton* underſtands *the laying on of Hands of* other Biſhops; and for want of that declares our *Pretended Biſhops* to be *No Biſhops at all.*

If this be a true and faithful Repreſentation of what *Stapleton* ſays upon this Head, can *Le Quien* with any Logick draw this Inference from it, that he *abſolutely denies*, in theſe Paſſages, *that our*

[g] Fortreſs, p. 376. Op. T. 2. p. 801.

Biſhops

Biſhops had any Impoſition of Hands at all? 'Tis of Service to the *Father* to ſay this was *Stapleton*'s Meaning, and no queſtion he ſays it with that Deſign, to perſuade his Readers, that his Author affirms, that they were made Biſhops *without Solemnity*, *without Ceremony*, that *Ceremony* eſpecially (which muſt have been uſed if they were ordained by King *Edward*'s Form) of *Impoſition of Hands*; and then they muſt ſee, that if *Stapleton* have any Authority with them, they muſt take it from him, that *Parker* and his Brethren had *no Solemnity*, *no Ceremony*, ſuch as is related in our Regiſter, at their Conſecration; but were conſecrated, not at *Lambeth*, as is the next Step to believe, but at the *Nag's-Head*. But can *Le Quien*, to ſerve this Turn, allow himſelf to make uſe of ſuch a palpable mean piece of Sophiſtry? Let *Stapleton* ſtand by, if you pleaſe, and *Le Quien* alone hold the Argument. *Parker*'s Regiſter, he ſays, is falſe; for it ſays that he was conſecrated by King *Edward*'s Ordinal, but that Ordinal was not uſed at his Conſecration. We ſay it was uſed: But he argues that it was not, becauſe the Ordinal requires the Ceremony of Impoſition of Hands, and that Ceremony was not made uſe of in conſecrating *Parker*. We ſay the Ceremony was made uſe of, and that four Perſons laid their Hands upon him. Here he takes *Stapleton*'s Words, "But "upon the Deprivation of the Catholick Bi- "ſhops, there were no true Biſhops left to lay "Hands upon him, nor had he Impoſition of "Hands from the *French*, or any other Biſhops "abroad, and therefore he had not that laying "on of Hands which *Timothy* and *Titus* had from "St. *Paul*, the laying on of Hands of the Prieſt- "hood, that is, the laying on of Hands of true "Biſhops." This is all *Le Quien*'s Proof, from whence he draws this Concluſion, That there was no Impoſition of Hands at all, nothing of that Ceremony

Ceremony uſed, no ſuch Perſons as the Regiſter names, no Body at all that laid Hands upon *Parker*, and conſequently he was not conſecrated according to King *Edward*'s Ordinal, and the Regiſter that ſays he was, is a Forgery. Here the *Father* may ſee his own Way of arguing, and if he has ſo good an Opinion of it, he may be ſo kind as not to take the Credit of it to himſelf, but to give it to the *Sage and Judicious Stapleton*. The ſame Expreſſion, of laying on of Hands of true Biſhops, is in another of *Le Quien*'s Citations from his *Counterblaſt to* Horne, whom he tells [h] *he was called to that Function only by Letters Patents of the Prince, without due Conſecration or Impoſition of Hands by any Biſhop or Biſhops living*, the *Impoſition of Hands which St.* Paul *evidently practiſed upon* Timothy, *and the univerſal Church has always uſed as the only and proper Means to order a Biſhop of the Church; and that neither he nor all his Fellows, being all unordered Prelates, would ever be able to make any ſufficient or reaſonable Anſwer (anſwering as Chriſtian Catholick Men) whereby it may appear that they may go for right Biſhops of Chriſt's Church, but they muſt remain as they were before, either meer Laymen or ſimple Prieſts. Le Quien* [i] from the *Latin* of the Tranſlator, has (in great Letters, for our Conviction) SINE CONSECRATIONE AUT IMPOSITIONE MANUUM CUJUSCUNQUE EPISCOPI: But he might have ſeen that the Tranſlator leaves out the Word *debitâ* before *Conſecratione*, and that the Author charges *Horne* with the Want (not of *all* or *any* but) of *due* Conſecration and Impoſition of Hands; with the Want of ſuch Impoſition of Hands as St. *Paul practiſed, and the univerſal Church uſed*, by which ſure it will not be pretended that he meant any laying on of Hands but of true Biſhops. And this is all the Ground which

[h] Counterblaſt, p. 458. Op. T. 2. p. 1144. [i] T. 1. p. 278.

he

he has here, to call *Horne* and his *Fellows unordered Prelates:* Not to obſerve, that he ties up *Horne* not to *anſwer* him but as a *Chriſtian Catholick Man*, which is juſt as wiſe a begging the Queſtion (ſuppoſing that *Horne* and he had differed about the Point of Epiſcopal Ordination) as it would have been in *Horne* to tell him he muſt not pretend to argue againſt him, except he ſpoke like a *Chriſtian Proteſtant.*

'Tis true that he ſays, in the firſt Words, that *Horne* was *called to his Function only by Letters Patents of the Prince*; but this implies no more than what muſt be conceived to follow from his denying that *Horne* had the *due Conſecration and Impoſition of Biſhops Hands*; for if he had not Epiſcopal Conſecration, he was not called to his Function by the *Spiritual* or *Eccleſiaſtical Authority*, and conſequently had no other Call but from the *Lay Power*, that is, from the Queen's *Letters Patents. Stapleton*'s firſt Queſtion in his *Fortreſs* is, [k] *Our Paſtors being diſplaced of their Rooms, and none left having Authority to conſecrate Biſhops or to make Prieſts (that being the Office of only Biſhops) by what* Authority *do the Pretended Biſhops of Proteſtants govern the Fold of Chriſt's Flock?* He means, by no Authority from the Church or her Biſhops; but only by the Grant of the Prince. The like Queſtion, in *Le Quien*'s [l] Citation from his *Return of Untruths to* Jewell, he puts to that Biſhop. He tells him firſt, " You and your Fellows have not " the Conſent of the Pope, or any Chriſtian Bi- " ſhop at all throughout all *Chriſtendom*, neither " are liked or allowed of any of them, but have " taken upon you that Office, WITHOUT ANY " IMPOSITION OF HANDS, without all Eccle- " ſiaſtical Authority, without all Order of Ca-

[k] Sup. p. 249. [l] T. 1. p. 276. Stapleton's Return, &c. p. 130. Op. T. 2. p. 431.

" nons

" nons and Right." Then adds, " I aſk not, " Who gave you Biſhopricks? but WHO MADE " YOU BISHOPS?" He means the ſame as his Brother *Harding*[m], " Tho' the Prince has promoted " you, you are Preſumers and Intruders of your " ſelves: Lands and Manors the Prince may " give you; Prieſthood and Biſhophood the " Prince cannot give you." The ſame *Stapleton* ſays of *Jewell* and his *Fellows*; Their Biſhopricks they might have from the Prince, but the Epiſcopal Order they could not have, having *no Impoſition of Hands*, nor ſo much as *a Conſent and Allowance* from any *Eccleſiaſtical Authority*, from the *Pope*, *or any Biſhop in* Chriſtendome.

9. Now if *Stapleton*, from his own avowed Principles (ſuppoſing his Principles to be right) had ſufficient Grounds to juſtify his declaring that *Horne*'s Conſecrators, *Parker*, *Young*, *Grindall*, and *Bentham*, and *Parker*'s Conſecrators, *Barlow*, *Scory*, *Coverdale*, and *Hodgskins*, were not True but Pretended Biſhops; might not he then truly affirm, that *Parker* and *Horne had not Hands laid over them*, *as* Auſtin *had by the* French *Biſhops*, *and* Timothy *and* Titus *by St.* Paul; that, being not conſecrated by true Biſhops, *they came not in by the Door*, *but ſtole in like Thieves*, *and by the Verdict of Scripture and Primitive Practice were No Biſhops*; that *they occupied the Rooms of Biſhops without laying on of the Hands of the Prieſthood*; that *they were unlawfully placed*, *without Authority from other*, *without laying on of Hands of the Prieſthood as Scripture requires*; that *they had not ſuch Ordination as the Biſhops of the Realm had at the firſt planting of the Chriſtian Faith*, *but were not ordained by laying on of Hands required in Scripture*, *laying on of Hands of other Biſhops*; *ſuch Impoſition*

[m] Detection of Jewell's Errors, fol. 197. b.

of Hands as St. Paul *evidently practiſed upon* Timothy, *and the univerſal Church has always uſed as the only and proper Means to order a Biſhop of the Church*; and therefore were both of them *unordered Prelates*; and had no *Call to their Functions but only by the Letters Patents of their Prince?* Might he not very truly have drawn up this whole Charge againſt *Parker* and *Horne*, and yet at the ſame time have believed, known, and confeſſed, that theſe two Prelates had the Hands laid upon each of them of the four Perſons above-named, who pretended to be true Biſhops, and acted as ſuch; but in his Opinion really were not true Biſhops, and conſequently had no Authority to give the Order to any others? If his believing, and knowing, and confeſſing this, might be conſiſtent with every Word that he had ſaid againſt *Parker*'s and *Horne*s having true Ordination, how can his uſing theſe Expreſſions be made an Argument to prove that he ſays they had not the laying on of the Hands of thoſe four Perſons, but that the Ceremony of Impoſition of Hands was not at all uſed by any Perſon at their Conſecration, and conſequently they were not conſecrated by King *Edward*'s Ordinal, which preſcribes the Uſe of that Ceremony? *Le Quien* may now ſee, if he pleaſes, whether *the Force* of ſo many of the Teſtimonies that he produces from *Stapleton*, as are here conſidered, is *eluded* by what he can ſhew to be a *frivolous Diſtinction*. Let him ſhew it to be frivolous to diſtinguiſh between *Stapleton*'s ſaying, as he really does, that our Biſhops were made without the Ceremony of the laying on of the Hands of *true Biſhops*, and his ſaying (as *Le Quien* would make us believe) that they were made without the Ceremony of the Impoſition of Hands of *any Perſons at all.*

10. But

10. But *Stapleton* may ſeem in one Place (cited already[n] for his declaring that they had not the laying on of Hands of the Prieſthood, *i. e.* true Biſhops) to ſay that they had no Impoſition of Hands at all, but that they not only omitted, but neglected and deſpiſed, that Ceremony. The Words are ſet down already, from the *Fortreſs*, *Now Proteſtants refuſe this Sacrament, deny ſuch Grace to be given, and do occupy the Rooms of Biſhops without laying on of Hands of the Prieſthood.* Here the former Part, our Biſhops *refuſing the Sacrament* of Orders, *&c.* may look like a Proof (or Explanation of the Meaning) of the latter, their being made Biſhops without the Ceremony of Impoſition of Hands, but *taking Poſſeſſion*, as *Le Quien*[o] expreſſes it, *of the Sees of the old Biſhops without having the Impoſition of Hands of the Presbytery, becauſe they had no Regard for it* (he muſt mean that Ceremony) *as not allowing a Place to* their *Sacrament of Orders among the Number of* ours. I do not ſay that *Stapleton* himſelf argues in this manner, tho' it looks like it. The Expreſſion he uſes is very odd and unguarded, that Proteſtants *refuſe* this Sacrament, if he means nothing more by it but that, in allowing but two Sacraments, Baptiſm and the Lord's Supper, (in our twenty fifth Article, and the Church Catechiſm) we exclude Orders, and four more of *their* Sacraments from the Number of *ours*. *Refuſing* the Sacrament of Orders, in no other reſpect than this, cannot imply that we refuſe Ordination, or that we deny that *Grace* is conferred in it by *Impoſition of Hands*, which *Stapleton* muſt know we never did, from the very Form annexed to the Impoſition of Hands in the Conſecration of Biſhops in King *Edward*'s Ordinal, *Take the Holy*

Stapleton's ſaying that the Proteſtants refuſe the Sacrament of Orders, no Proof that he means they refuſed Ordination.

[n] Sup. p. 263. [o] T. 1. p. 271.

Ghoſt, and remember that thou ſtir up the Grace *of God which is in thee by* Impoſition of Hands. Here therefore there does appear to be a Want of the *Rational Head*, in a Writer that ſtates the Controverſy between us and them in this manner. But if his ſaying our Biſhops *refuſed that Sacrament* be interpreted to be an Argument to prove that he affirms that our Church did not uſe Impoſition of Hands in the Ordination of our firſt Biſhops; it proves in like manner that, according to *Stapleton*'s Judgment, our Church had diſuſed that Ceremony almoſt ever ſince that time; becauſe for as long time as from the Convocation, *Ann.* 1562. Orders has ſtood excluded from being a Sacrament, in our twenty fifth *Article*; and conſequently, by this Argument, we muſt for ſo long time have laid aſide the Uſe of this Ceremony. But the conſtant Practice of our Church in ordaining our Biſhops, Prieſts, and Deacons, by the Form in King *Edward*'s Ordinal, proves that the Ceremony of Impoſition of Hands required by that Ordinal has been conſtantly uſed. And if this were not Proof enough, *Stapleton* himſelf will appear in our Vindication, who in his *Relectio Principiorum fidei Doctrinalium, Controv.* 2. *Queſt.* 4. *Art.* 4. ſays, [p] *Anglo-Calviniſtæ & omnes hodiè Sectæ hâc Ceremoniâ & certâ Ordinatione utuntur: The* Engliſh Calviniſts, *and all the Sects at that time uſed the Ceremony of Impoſition of Hands.* Tho' he owns in the ſame Place, that all, except ſome moderate *Lutherans* that were led by *Melanchthon*, rejected Orders from being a Sacrament. He ſays again in the next Page, that the *French Calviniſts* uſed the Ceremony from the Year 1559. and the *Engliſh Calviniſts ridiculouſly* uſed it after they had been firſt placed in their Biſhopricks only by the Queen's Authority. This may be a ſuf-

[p] Op. T. 1. p. 642.

ficient

ficient Answer, if any Body would pretend to argue from those Words, That *Protestants refuse the Sacrament of Orders*, as if *Stapleton* meant that they refused to have any Imposition of Hands at all in the Ordinations of their Bishops and Clergy.

I may now conclude, that it plainly appears from the Places cited here from *Stapleton*, out of the *Fortress of Faith*, *Return of Untruths to* Jewell, and *Counterblast to* Horne, That that Author does indeed positively deny our first Bishops having had the Imposition of *Bishops Hands*; and if this cannot be understood in any other Sense, but that he declares, That they had no Hands laid upon them at all, either by such as *Stapleton* believed to be true Bishops, or by any other Persons *whatsoever*, such as were not *right Bishops of Christ's Church*, in his Judgment, (tho' they might pretend to the Episcopal Order) but were only either *meer Laymen or simple Priests*; if this must be his Meaning, then it must be granted that he denies the *very Fact* of their having any Consecration. But if the Words are capable of this Sense, That some Persons took upon them to give *Parker*, and *Jewell*, and *Horne*, *&c.* Imposition of Hands for the Episcopal Order, who were, in his Opinion, no Bishops themselves; then nothing more can be inferred from them, but that he denies they had a *lawful or valid* Ordination from these Persons.

11. The Author takes upon him to reject the Ordinations of the Protestant Clergy in general, and of ours in particular, for this Defect, of their not having Imposition of *Episcopal* Hands, in other Parts of his Works, written much later than his first Treatises in *English*, his *Promptuarium Catholicum*, and *Relectio Principiorum Doctrinalium*, a Review and Abridgment of a former Work *De Principiis fidei Doctrinalibus*. In the *Promptuarium Catholicum*, I observed before that he directs

Stapleton's Words in the Promptuarium Catholicum, *cannot be understood of any thing more than his denying that our*

Biſhops had Impoſition of Biſhops Hands.

rects the Preachers how they are to ſhew the Want of Ordination in the Proteſtant Churches, from ſome Texts in the Goſpels for the Feaſts of St. *Andrew*, and St. *Mark*, and *Tueſday* after *Pentecoſt*. He is moſt full in the Diſcourſe from the Goſpel on St. *Mark*'s Day, from whence I find a very large Tranſcript of moſt that he ſays, in the [q] *Remarker*. He draws, from *Stapleton*'s Words there, no other Concluſion than that he ſays, [r] *That they had no Epiſcopal Impoſition of Hands from any True Biſhops:* And [s] *That the* Engliſh *Pretended Biſhops had no true Ordination, becauſe they had no* Impoſition of Hands *from any* Biſhop. *Le Quien* had not looked into this Part of the Author's Works, but I muſt not diſſemble my Opinion, that if he had, he would have made another Uſe of the laſt Part of the Tranſcript in the *Remarker*. The Words there are, "[t] Tales alieni, prophani Dominicæ ac Divinæ unitatis inimici fuerunt *Calvinus*, *Lutherus*, omneſque hodie in *Angliâ* ſunt *Pſeudoepiſcopi*, qui veris Epiſcopis ad unum omnibus Poteſtate Regiâ eâque fœmineâ ejectis & in vincula conjectis, Epiſcopis inquam qui in Eccleſiâ Dei Ordinatione ſuccedaneâ præſidebant, nemini ſuccedentes ſed a ſeipſis incipientes, *à nemine manûs impoſitionem accipiebant*, Ne quidem a *Germanis* vel *Gallis* aut alicujus *Reformatæ*, ut vocant, Eccleſiæ Paſtoribus." The Author here may with ſome Colour be pretended to declare, That our Biſhops had no Ordination or Impoſition of Hands at all, not only none from any Biſhops, but from any Perſons whatſoever; for this may appear, at the firſt ſight, to be the Meaning of thoſe Words, *A nemine manûs impoſitionem accipiebant: They had Impoſition of Hands from none.* But there needs

[q] P. 70, 71. [r] P. 70. [s] P. 71. [t] Op. T. 4. p. 853.

nothing more to ſhew what *Stapleton* really meant by this Expreſſion, but to compare this Paſſage in the *Promptuarium* with the firſt of thoſe cited before [t] from the *Fortreſs of Faith:* "Theſe Pre-"tended Biſhops of Proteſtants, whereas the "whole Number of our Paſtors were diſplaced "of their Rooms, none being left in the Realm "having Authority to conſecrate Biſhops——"by what Authority do they govern the Fold of "Chriſt's Flock? Who laid Hands over them as "St. *Paul* expreſly did unto *Timothy* and *Titus*, "when he made them Biſhops?" We ſee here, that what he ſays of the Want of Ordination in our Biſhops, is in Conſequence of what he ſays firſt of the Deprivation of theirs, that thereupon our Biſhops *had no Hands laid upon them.* But what Hands? Such as St. *Paul* laid upon *Timothy* and *Titus*; that is, *Epiſcopal Impoſition of Hands*, as the Words prove, and is ſhewed there more at large, particularly from the Places of Scripture quoted by the Author in the *Fortreſs*; from which very Places he argues again, in this Diſcourſe upon the Goſpel, for the Neceſſity of the Impoſition of Biſhops Hands, to a true Miſſion of the Biſhops and Clergy. This ſhews what Impoſition of Hands it is, the Want of which he objects to our Biſhops in theſe Words of the *Promptuarium*, "Veris Epiſcopis ad unum omnibus ejectis——"à *nemine* manûs impoſitionem accipiebant." Where his laſt Words, *That they had Impoſition of Hands from* None; are as plainly ſpoken in conſequence of the former, *That all the true Biſhops to a Man were diſplaced*, as the like Words in the *Fortreſs*; and yet they can have no Coherence or Connection with them, except their Meaning is the ſame as it is there, That all the Biſhops of their Communion being deprived, there were no

[t] Sup. p. 249.

true Biſhops left, from whom the Proteſtant Prelates could receive Impoſition of Hands. For what Connexion can there be between theſe Words, That *all* their *true Biſhops were deprived*, and the Words that follow, That *our Biſhops had Impoſition of Hands from none*, if he means by *none* (not *true Biſhops*, but) *no Perſons whatſoever?* Suppoſing theirs to have been the true Biſhops, it is a Conſequence that upon their Deprivation our Prelates had no true Biſhops left to lay Hands upon them; but it does not follow that there were no other Perſons whatſoever left in the Realm, none that might be reputed Biſhops of the Proteſtants, who tho' in *Stapleton*'s Judgment they were no more than Presbyters or Laymen, yet he might know that from theſe Perſons our Prelates had received Impoſition of Hands.

This will be farther clear, if we compare the next Words of the Author in both theſe Paſſages; in the *Fortreſs* it follows immediately, "Whether "went they to be conſecrated, into *France*, *Spain*, "or *Germany*, ſeeing that at Home there was no "Number of ſuch as might and would ſerve "their Turn? No, no." Do we not ſee the ſame Words almoſt copied out again in the *Promptuarium?* where after the Words *à nemine manûs impoſitionem accipiebant*; *They had Impoſition of Hands from* none; he adds, *Ne quidem a* Germanis *vel* Gallis; *Not ſo much as from the* Germans *or* French. And for what Reaſon does he in both Places object to them their not going over to be conſecrated in *Germany* or *France?* Is it not becauſe, tho' they had not a Number of true Biſhops at Home, yet, if they had pleaſed, they might have helped themſelves, by obtaining ſuch Impoſition of Hands in thoſe Countries, as they could not have in their own; that is, the laying on of Hands of other true and regular Biſhops of the *Roman* Church? So that there can be no Senſe

in theſe Words, *Ne quidem a* Germanis *vel* Gallis; *Not from the* Germans *or* French; if the former Words, of their having Impoſition of Hands from *none*, be underſtood to mean (not from no true Biſhops, but) from no Perſon at all, Biſhop or Presbyter, or any Body elſe. For to what purpoſe does he mean they ſhould have gone to be ordained in *France* or *Germany*, and blame them for neglecting to go thither? Were they to go to no better Purpoſe, than to find out ſome Layman there, or at moſt ſome Presbyter, to lay Hands upon them? Beſides the Ridiculouſneſs of making *Stapleton* ſay this, in a Diſcourſe where his whole Deſign is to diſprove the Proteſtants having any true Miſſion, from their Want of the Impoſition of *Biſhops* Hands, it muſt ſuppoſe that he means, that there were not left in the Realm not ſo much as any Presbyters whom they might deſire to lay Hands upon them; for they could not otherwiſe be pretended to be under a Neceſſity to ſeek for Ordination Abroad, if they were to have no better there than they might more eaſily have had at Home. If therefore it would be ridiculous for the Author to ſay they ſhould have gone thither, but for a better Ordination than, as their Caſe was at that time, he believed they could have in *England*; it follows evidently, that his Meaning muſt be, that for want of the laying on of Hands (not of any Perſons whatſoever, but) of *Engliſh* Biſhops, they ſhould have gone to receive it from Biſhops Abroad.

It follows immediately in the next Words after *Ne quidem à* Germanis *vel* Gallis, "Nec ab ali-"cujus *Reformatæ* Eccleſiæ *Paſtoribus*;" That our Biſhops had not the laying on of the Hands of the *Reformed Paſtors* Abroad. There is nothing like this in the *Fortreſs of Faith*, where he only charges them with the Neglect of getting Epiſcopal Ordination from the Biſhops of *France*,

Spain, or *Germany:* But it ſeems to be a new Thought, to which he is led by ſomething that he ſaid before in this Diſcourſe. One Argument to prove the Neceſſity of Epiſcopal Impoſition of Hands, he brings from *Calvin*'s own Confeſſion, from whoſe Words in his *Inſtitutions*, he offers to prove that he expreſly acknowledges, 1. *The Neceſſity of Ordination.* 2. *Of Impoſition of Hands.* 3. *That this Impoſition of Hands muſt be by* Biſhops *only.* This laſt Particular might ſeem to be ſomething extraordinary, if *Stapleton* did not immediately explain himſelf, That Calvin *looked upon his Paſtors to be the ſame with the* Biſhops, *and his Miniſters the ſame with the* Presbyters *of the* Roman *Church.* His finding out ſuch a Sort of Biſhops among the *Calviniſts*, might lead him to reproach our firſt Biſhops, that they had no Impoſition of Hands, either from the true Biſhops at Home or Abroad, or ſo much as from *Calvin*'s Biſhops, the Paſtors of the foreign *Reformed Churches.* But this Addition would not make his *Induction* compleat, if it was his Meaning that they had not Hands laid upon them by any Perſons whatſoever; except he had ſaid further, That they had no Impoſition of Hands from any *Pretended* Biſhops of King *Edward*'s Nomination, or from any Presbyters of the *Romiſh* Communion, or their own, or from any meer Laymen, who might (as he ſays of *Calvin*, *Beza*, and others) pretend to an *immediate* extraordinary Vocation, to act with ſo great Power in the Church.

So I may conclude that the Author does not (in theſe Words, *They received Impoſition of Hands from* none) mean that they had not any Impoſition of Hands whatſoever, but only that they had not the laying on of Biſhops Hands. And his own Words ſhew that he had no other Meaning in a like Expreſſion before in the ſame Diſcourſe, when he ſays that the *Firſt Maſters* (as he calls them)

them) of the *Calviniſts* and *Lutherans*, *à* nemine *mittebantur*, that is, as it may be interpreted, had *no Miſſion from* any Perſon whatſoever: But his expreſs Words juſt before, *That none can lawfully be ſent but by the Impoſition of* Biſhops *Hands*; and *That the* Hereticks *want ſuch a Miſſion, becauſe they are ſent by* no Biſhops, ſhew clearly, that their being ſent by *no Biſhops*, is all that he means by their being ſent by *none*.

I need not ſtay to give the Senſe of the other Words which he has in this Place, *Nemini ſuccedentes, ſed a ſeipſis incipientes*. He takes this Expreſſion, it is plain, from the ſame Words in St. *Cyprian*, of *Novatian*, for his breaking in upon the Succeſſion of Biſhops in the Church, by intruding himſelf into the See of *Rome*, already filled by a lawful Biſhop, *Cornelius*. It could not be St. *Cyprian*'s Meaning to deny his having Impoſition of Hands, which he certainly had from three true (tho' ſchiſmatical) Biſhops; but to deny that he could be the Succeſſor to *Fabian*, or to any in the Line before him, becauſe the Succeſſion was already filled by another. And in this Caſe *Stapleton* draws a Parallel between *Novatian* and our Biſhops, thoſe of them who during the Lives of the ejected Popiſh Prelates were inveſted in their Sees. St. *Cyprian* has this Expreſſion likewiſe, in regard to ſuch as *Novatian*; Nemine *Epiſcopatum dante, Epiſcopi ſibi nomen aſſumpſerunt*; whereby he does not mean neither, that none laid Hands upon him or them, to give them the Epiſcopal Order, or to inveſt them in the Sees of Biſhops, but that it was attempted by ſuch as could have no Authority to do it.

It may make the Reader ſome Amends for the Length of what is ſaid here in order to clear the Senſe of the Author, to divert him with the Account he gives of the *Epiſcopal Succeſſion* at *Geneva* and in *Germany*, upon the Reformation. *The Biſhop*

of Geneva (he ſays) *being ejected, firſt* Farell, *after him* Calvin, *then* Beza, *filled the Chair. So* Luther, *in Oppoſition to the Biſhop of* Lipſick, *ſet up a new* Chair *for himſelf at* Wittemberg, *wherein he was ſucceeded by* Melancthon, *and he by* George Major. So he is pleaſed (in this odd Piece of Hiſtory) to make them Biſhops and place them in *Epiſcopal Chairs*, to make his Parallel more exact between them and *Novatian* and the *Donatiſt* Biſhops.

12. I may leave it to the Reader to ſatisfy himſelf, that *Stapleton* has the ſame Meaning in his other Diſcourſes, from the Goſpels on the Feaſt of St. *Andrew*, *Whitſun-Tueſday*, and the ſeventh *Sunday* (as they reckon it) after *Pentecoſt*; in all which it will be found that his Objection againſt the Miſſion and Ordination of the Proteſtants is, that they were not ſent by thoſe who have a Commiſſion from our bleſſed Saviour and his Apoſtles, to [v] *make others Fiſhers of Men, by ſending them forth to preach*; to bring them in [w] *by the* Door *into the Sheepfold*; or (as in the Goſpel for St. *Mark*'s Day) to ſend them forth *to be Labourers in Chriſt's Harveſt*; which Commiſſion he is poſitive that none have but the true Biſhops. The other Part of his Works where he delivers his Senſe (to the ſame Purpoſe as in the *Promptuarium Catholicum*) is his *Relectio Principiorum Doctrinalium*, which we have the more Reaſon to conſider, becauſe *Le Quien* [x] brings from thence his laſt Citation out of *Stapleton*, and inſiſts upon it that *no Body can doubt, after ſo plain and expreſs Words*, as he produces there from his Author, *but the Author abſolutely denies that* Parker *and Queen* Elizabeth's *firſt Biſhops ever received any Impoſition of Hands* at all *to make them Biſhops, ſo much as according to King*

The Author's Words in the Relectio Principiorum Doctrinalium, *do not require to be underſtood but of his Denial that they*

[v] Evangelium in Feſto S. Andreæ. [w] Evang. in Feriâ 3ª Pentec. [x] T. 1. p. 280, 281.

Edward

Edward *the Sixth's Ordinal.* The Citation is from the *Second Controverſy, Quæſt.* 4. *Art.* 4. [y] where the Author delivers his Mind in a Method more *ſcholaſtical*, by laying down and offering Proof of ſeveral *Concluſions:* "Firſt, *That Impoſition of* "*Hands* is neceſſary in the Ordinations of our "Biſhops and Presbyters—— Secondly, That "this Impoſition of Hands is to be by *Biſhops* "only, and is invalid if by any other Perſons, "*Presbyters* or *Laicks*—— Thirdly, That thoſe "who have not this Impoſition of Hands have "no Authority to adminiſter the Sacraments, or "to Preach, or to exerciſe the Diſcipline of the "Church, or to make Laws, or preſcribe Cere-"monies for the Church to obſerve—— Fourth-"ly, (which is only to apply the former Concluſions to the Caſe of thoſe whom he calls Hereticks) "That the *Lutherans*, *Calviniſts*,, and all other "*Sects*, have no true Miniſtry at all; but that all "their Clergy are *Thieves* and *Robbers*, according "to the Words of our Bleſſed Saviour, *John* x." His Proof follows immediately in the next Words, "Patet, quia per impoſitionem manuum *Epiſco-*"*porum* non ſunt ordinati." *This is clear, becauſe they were not ordained by the laying on of* Biſhops *Hands.* Here we ſee, as far as he goes in Point of Doctrine, the Ground of his Charge againſt the Proteſtants, that they have no true Orders, is their Want of *Epiſcopal* Impoſition of Hands. But he proceeds farther in the Way of Hiſtory, in the Words following: "Sed partim ſine ullâ "ordinatione ſe intruſerunt, ut *Calvinus* ipſe, "*Beza*, *Melanctbon*, & multi alii: partim a So-"lis Presbyteris ordinati ſunt, ut a *Luthero* qui-"dam in *Germaniâ*, *Ann.* 1541. partim denique, "cum à nemine ipſi ordinarentur, alios tamen "poſtea per manuum impoſitionem ordinârunt;

were ordained by true Biſhops.

[y] Op. T. 1. p. 642, 643.

"ut

" ut nunc paſſim *Calviniſtæ* faciunt, juxta Decre-
" tum quoddam in Conventiculo ipſorum, in
" *Lutetiæ* Suburbiis habito, Ann. 1559. conſti-
" tutum. *Anglo-Calviniſtæ*, quum in principio
" Solâ Regiâ authoritate Cathedras Epiſcopales
" occuparent, nunc per manuum impoſitionem
" Miniſtros ſuos ridiculè ordinant, allatrantibus
" *Puritanis*, & totam illam ceremoniam deriden-
" tibus, atque Seniorum Conſiſtoria, per quos
" ordinationes fiant, magno clamore flagitantibus."
Here he firſt ſets down three Ways whereby the *Lutherans* and *Calviniſts* came into the Miniſtry, without the Impoſition of Biſhops Hands: Firſt, That ſome of them, as *Calvin*, *Beza*, and many others, took the Office upon them without *any* Ordination *at all*. Secondly, Others, as ſome who were ordained by *Luther*, had their Ordination from *Presbyters* only. Laſtly, Others, tho' they themſelves had been ordained by *none*, yet (as the *French Calviniſts* did after the Year 1559.) ordained others by the Impoſition of their Hands. Then he paſſes to the *Engliſh Calviniſts*, who (he ſays) after they at firſt took Poſſeſſion of the Epiſcopal Sees by vertue only of the *Royal Authority*, now *ridiculouſly* ordain their Clergy by laying on of Hands, wherein they are oppoſed and derided by the *Puritans*, pretending that the Ordinations ought to be by their Conſiſtories of Paſtors and Elders.

This is his Account of the Manner how the firſt Reformers of the *Lutherans* and *Calviniſts*, and the firſt Biſhops of the Church of *England*, came into the Miniſtry: Wherein it is eaſy to obſerve that he is not ſo clear and intelligible, or exact, as he was before in the doctrinal Part. Between the Perſons whom he firſt names, *Calvin*, *Beza*, and others, and the Reformers in *France*, whom he ſpeaks of in the *third* place, he pretends to make ſome Diſtinction, but without a Difference.

rence. They all took upon them the Miniſterial Offices, *without any Ordination at all*, either from Biſhops or Presbyters, and *without* any *Impoſition of Hands whatſoever*; but looked upon it that they had an *extraordinary and immediate Call*; and in conſequence of that, thought they were inveſted with a Power of ordaining other Miniſters by the laying on of their Hands. The *Lutherans*, he owns, were ordained by one that was himſelf a *Presbyter*; and he might have added that that *Presbyter*, *Luther*, had (as he owns likewiſe of [z] *Bucer*, *Zwinglius*, and *Oecolampadius*) received the Order of Prieſthood from Biſhops of the *Roman* Church; whatever they might afterwards act in laying their Hands upon others (as *Luther* did upon *Amſdorf*, *&c.*) upon a Perſuaſion, either that the Epiſcopal Order and that of Prieſthood were one and the ſame, or that they had a Warrant to take upon them a higher Authority than they had by their ordinary Call to the Office of Presbyters.

But we are to ſee whether in what relates to our firſt Biſhops (the *Engliſh Calviniſts*, as he calls them) he makes their Caſe the ſame with that of *Calvin*, and *Beza*, and the firſt Reformers in *France*, That the *Engliſh* Biſhops, as well as they, had *no Ordination*, *no Impoſition of Hands whatſoever*. *Le Quien* challenges any Body to make the leaſt Doubt of it, after he has read the Author's Words cited by him, *Anglo-Calviniſtæ*, *&c.* But the *Father* might have ſeen, if he had pleaſed, that it is far from being ſo clear and indiſputable, that the Author had this Meaning. His firſt Words are, "Cum in principio Solâ *Regiâ* au-"thoritate Cathedras Epiſcopales occuparent," *They were at firſt inveſted in their Epiſcopal Sees only by the* Queen's *Authority*. If we will give the Author leave to be his own Interpreter, there needs no more but to read his Words to *Horne*,

[z] Prompt. Cathol. Evang. in Feſto S. Andreæ.

cited

cited and ſufficiently explained above, where he tells him that "he was called to his Function "only by *Letters Patents* of the Prince, without "*due* Conſecration or Impoſition of Hands by "any *Biſhop or Biſhops* living, the Impoſition of "Hands which St. *Paul* evidently practiſed, and "the univerſal Church always uſed as the only "and proper Means to ordain a Biſhop of the "Church." Is not *Horne*'s being called to his Function only by the *Letters Patents of the Prince*, the ſame with his being inveſted in the Epiſcopal See by the *Royal Authority only?* And upon what Ground is that affirmed, but upon his not having had *due* Conſecration and Impoſition of Hands by any *Biſhop or Biſhops* living, *&c.?* So, in this Place, *Stapleton* had firſt declared of the Proteſtant Miniſters in general, and of our Biſhops in particular, that they had no true Orders, becauſe they had not *Epiſcopal* Impoſition of Hands; and after this ſays farther, That our Biſhops took and held their Biſhopricks only by the *Royal Authority:* Is this any thing more than what follows from their not having had Epiſcopal Ordination? If they were not (as the Author ſays) ordained by Biſhops; they could not be inveſted in their Sees by the Church's Authority, that being ſeated in none but the Biſhops; and if they were not called to their Functions and inveſted in their Sees by the Church's Authority, they either muſt be made Biſhops by no Authority at all, or only by the *Lay Power*; that is, by the *Letters Patents* of the *Queen*, her nominating them at firſt to the *Chapters*, by whom they were elected, then iſſuing out her *Mandates* for their Confirmation and Conſecration, and granting them the Temporalties of their Biſhopricks, upon their being confirmed and conſecrated by ſuch Perſons as ſhe had appointed.

[a] Sup. p. 268.

So

Beſides, it will preſently appear (when we come to the [b] *Counterblaſt*) that *Stapleton* charges our Biſhops with their being *illegally* ordained, becauſe they were conſecrated by King *Edward*'s Form before it was authorized by Parliament; conſequently, his Meaning in this Place may be, "That "having at firſt no legal Conſecration, they held "their Sees not by Law, but only by the *Queen's* "Authority," as the learned [c] F. *Le Courayer* interprets the Words. But ſtill the Author cannot be interpreted to mean, that they had no Impoſition of Hands at all, becauſe he confeſſes, that they were conſecrated by King *Edward*'s Form, which they could not be, without that Ceremony being uſed in their Conſecration.

9. *Stapleton*'s next Words are, "Nunc per ma-"nuum impoſitionem Miniſtros ſuos ridiculè or-"dinant;" *At this time they ridiculouſly ordain their Miniſters by Impoſition of Hands.* Theſe, together with the Words foregoing, *Le Quien* and the *Remarker* are willing to underſtand in this Senſe, "That whereas our Biſhops in the Beginning had "themſelves no Impoſition of Hands at all, yet "afterwards they were ſo abſurd as to make uſe "of that Ceremony in ordaining others, which had "not been uſed in their own Ordination." But can they pretend that the Words require to be thus underſtood? Or is it not plain that they may be otherwiſe interpreted, conſiſtently with the Truth of the Fact, and with *Stapleton*'s Confeſſion of their being ordained by King *Edward*'s Form?

Firſt, the Words will eaſily admit of the Senſe which *Le Quien*'s *Learned Adverſary* [d] ſuppoſes them to have, "That whereas they were ordained at firſt "by King *Edward*'s Form, before it was autho-"rized by Parliament, and conſequently were no "Biſhops by *Law*, but only by the *Queen*'s *Grant*; "yet after that Form was confirmed by the Par-

[b] Infr. p. 301. [c] B. 3. c. 4. p. 365, 366. [d] Ibid.

liament

" liament 8 *Eliz.* they were ſo vain as to think they " had full Authority to execute the Epiſcopal " Function in ordaining others, as if it were not " *ridiculous* to imagine, that a Parliament had any " Power to give them that Authority."

Secondly, it is very eaſy and natural to underſtand the Words in this Senſe, " That whereas " they were made Biſhops at firſt not by the " *Church*'s, but only by the *Queen*'s Authority, " having not the Hands of any *Biſhops* laid upon " them to give them the Epiſcopal Order; yet " they were ſo fooliſh and preſumptuous as to think " they could *validly* confer holy Orders upon o- " thers by the laying on of their Hands, tho' they " had never received any *valid* Ordination them- " ſelves." I may leave it to *Le Quien* or the *Remarker* to ſhew, that the Author's Words are not capable of being interpreted either in this or the former Senſe; in both which they are inconſiſtent with the Pretence of *Stapleton*'s denying that our Biſhops had any Impoſition of Hands *at all*, but can only mean, that the Impoſition of Hands which they had was not *valid*, or not *legal*.

But they are poſitive that the thing wherein *Stapleton* ſays they made themſelves *ridiculous* [c], was their uſing that Ceremony in the Ordinations of the reſt of the Clergy, which had not been uſed in their own. Suppoſe then that they themſelves had no hands at all laid upon them, what muſt make it ſo *ridiculous* for them afterwards to lay their hands upon others? Muſt it not be, becauſe they could have no Authority to ordain others, and their attempting to ordain them by the Impoſition of their Hands muſt, for want of that Authority, be vain and preſumptuous, invalid, and of no effect? And would not the Caſe be much the ſame, tho' they had Hands laid upon them, if it were by Laymen only, or by Deacons, or Bresbyters, or any Perſons but *true Biſhops?* The Author himſelf de-

[c] Le Quien, T. 1. p. 281. Remarks, p. 74.

clares

clares this here in his ſecond Concluſion, *That Impoſition of Hands is to be by* Biſhops *only, and is* invalid *if by any others*, Presbyters or Laicks. If therefore he looked upon our Prelates as not having the Impoſition of Biſhops Hands, muſt he not in conſequence think that any Act of theirs, in laying Hands afterwards upon the Clergy for Ordination, was vain and preſumptuous, invalid and ineffectual? and might he not then juſtly declare it to be fooliſh and *ridiculous?* We may hear him elſewhere expreſs himſelf very plainly in like manner. In his Diſcourſe upon the Goſpel for the Feaſt of St. *Mark*[s], he argues againſt the Miſſion of Proteſtants from the Confeſſion of *Calvin* himſelf, That it requires the Impoſition of *Biſhops* Hands; therefore themſelves, he ſays, *have no Miſſion becauſe they are ſent by* no Biſhops. He objects to himſelf that at that time the *Calviniſts* and *Lutherans* did moſt of them ſend their Miniſters by Impoſition of Hands; but anſwers that their *Firſt Maſters* had no Miſſion, that is, by the Hands of Biſhops, conſequently their preſent *imaginary Miſſion was* (*merum nugamentum*) *mere trifling*; that is, in another Word, *ridiculous*.

I need not add, that the *Remarker* does, as uſual, confute himſelf in this Particular. Preſently after he has cited the Words, *Suos Miniſtros* ridiculè *ordinant*, he ſays, "It is juſtly termed ridiculous, "becauſe having no Ordination themſelves they "could give none to others." If after *themſelves* he had ſaid, by the *laying on of Biſhops Hands*, he had then hit upon the Author's true Meaning, and might have ſaved himſelf the Trouble of that which follows, "That it would be very ab-"ſurd in *Stapleton* to make ſuch an Objection, if "it was publickly known that the firſt of thoſe

[s] Op. T. 4. p. 853. [t] P. 74.

"Prelates

" Prelates had been made with the ſame Ceremo-
" nies as they themſelves uſed afterwards in ma-
" king others."

The laſt thing in this Paſſage is, That the *Engliſh Puritans* (the Presbyterian Party he means) *laugh'd at this whole Ceremony, and clamoured for the Ordinations to be made* in the Way of *their Conſiſtories*. *Le Quien* would have it, that our Prelates expoſed themſelves to be thus inſulted by the Puritans, by their laying Hands upon others, when they had received no Impoſition of Hands themſelves. But he might have conſidered that his Author underſtood the State of the Caſe between that Party and our Biſhops much better; *viz.* That the Puritans, tho' they knew our Biſhops had Impoſition of Hands from true Biſhops, yet firſt they were diſpoſed, in Principle, to ſnarl and *bark at* them (as *Stapleton* expreſſes it) for taking too much upon them, in pretending to be of an higher Order than the Presbyters, and reſerving to themſelves the ſole Power and Authority of Ordination. Secondly, they made a Mockery of the Ceremony of Epiſcopal Impoſition of Hands, becauſe they were ſo well conceited of their own Uſe of it by the Paſtors and Elders in their Conſiſtories, that they looked upon that only to be the true Apoſtolical laying on of Hands of the *Presbytery*. Laſtly, That, in their Opinion, this Ceremony ought to be performed only in the Pariſh Church where the Miniſter was to ſerve, and not in the Private Chapels of the Biſhops; in a *Congregation*, and not in a *Corner*, as *Le Quien* and his Follower have been now ſufficiently taught to underſtand the Author of the *Admonition*, whoſe Words they were forward to interpret as a plain Proof of the Ordination of our firſt Biſhops in that which the *Remarker* calls the *Nag's-Head-Corner*.

[c] F. Le Courayer's Def. of his Diſſert. Vol. 1. p. 189, 190.

13. From

13. From this View of ſo many Places in *Stapleton*'s firſt and latter Parts of his Works, it appears how little Warrant *Le Quien* can pretend to have for aſſuring us, "[h] That the Author conſtantly every where maintains that *Horne*, and "Queen *Elizabeth*'s firſt Biſhops had not received ſo much as the Ordination preſcribed by "King *Edward*'s Ordinal, but were inveſted in "their Sees without Solemnity, without Ceremony, without Impoſition of Hands, by vertue only of the Queen's Letters Patents." If it be the ſame thing to have no Impoſition of Hands by any Perſon whatſoever, as not to have the Impoſition of Biſhops Hands, it muſt be granted that the *Father* gives us the true Senſe of his Author, and makes him a Witneſs againſt the Fact of their Ordinations, and the Truth of the Relation of them in the *Lambeth* Regiſter. But if otherwiſe, it muſt be ſaid he is either very much miſtaken, or has a Deſign to put a Fallacy upon his Readers. He is fair in laying down the State of the Controverſy; "[i] That it was the capital Point of Diſpute on the Side of their Doctors (*Stapleton*, *&c.*) not whether the Ordinations that our Biſhops had received were valid "or invalid, but to diſpute their having been ordained in any Manner whatſoever." But when he comes to prove this, from *Stapleton*'s denying (no more than) that they were ordained, or had Hands laid upon them, by *true Biſhops*; it is plain that this can be a Proof of nothing more but that they had not Impoſition of Hands from Perſons that had Power to give them a *valid* Ordination, and not that they had no Hands laid upon them by any Perſons whatſoever.

[h] T. 1. p. 269. [i] T. 1. p. 246.

In an Author ſo Rational and Judicious, as he is repreſented to be, we might expect to find a Reaſon for his affirming that our Prelates had no Biſhops to lay Hands upon them, but there is none in all that we meet with in the Places above-cited, except what he ſays in the *Fortreſs*, and repeats again in the *Promptuarium*, that their Biſhops, the *whole Number* of them, *all the true Biſhops to a Man being diſplaced*, and our Prelates not applying themſelves to the Biſhops in *Germany*, *France*, and elſewhere, for Conſecration, it follows that our Prelates muſt be looked upon as having no true Biſhops to give them the Order. And if this be his Reaſon, it muſt be upon a Perſuaſion that no Biſhops but ſuch as were in the Communion of the Church of *Rome* were true Biſhops; or at leaſt that none but ſuch could have Authority to execute their Epiſcopal Function in conſecrating other Biſhops. But if this be his Senſe, he cannot be interpreted to deny that they had in fact any Impoſition of Hands at all, but only that they had not any valid or lawful Impoſition of Hands.

The Remarker's *Ignorance of the true State of the Point in Diſpute about the Fact of the Ordinations and the Truth of the Regiſter.*

14. There may perhaps be Reaſon to think, that both *Le Quien* and I are under a Miſtake, in what we ſuppoſe to be the Queſtion relating to the *Fact* of the Ordination of our Biſhops: And that it is not only, as we conceive, "Whether "they had any Impoſition of Hands from any "Perſons whatſoever, or particularly from thoſe "Perſons who are related to be their Conſecrators "in the *Lambeth* Regiſter?" But the Queſtion of Fact is likewiſe, "Whether they had Impoſi-"tion of Hands in fact from *true Biſhops?*" If this be granted to be the Queſtion, then we have Proof enough from *Stapleton*, that he denies their having Hands laid upon them by true Biſhops, and conſequently denies that they had Impoſition

poſition of Hands in *Fact*. But what Ground have we to take this to be the Queſtion of Fact? No leſs than the Authority of the *Remarker*, who, if I underſtand him, plainly makes this to be the State of the Queſtion; with how great Judgment and Acuteneſs, muſt be left to the Reader to determine. He is as poſitive as *Le Quien*, in [k] declaring the Account in the *Lambeth* Regiſter to be falſe, and the Regiſter to be *incredible*, as he expreſſes it; and attempts to make Proof of what he ſays from the *Objections of the Catholick Convertiſts*, and of *Stapleton* in particular, of whom he tells us, [l] *That he expreſly denies our Prelates to be Biſhops upon this Account beſides others, That they had* no *Impoſition of Hands. Not only no* valid *one, but none* at all, Here, if there had been a full Period, we might underſtand him to follow *Le Quien* in his Way of ſtating the Point in diſpute: But, in the very next Words, we ſee he falls off preſently, and after *none at all*, adds, *from any Biſhops*. Till I had read this, I was of Opinion, that *no Impoſition of Biſhops Hands*, was the ſame (in regard to the Perſons impoſing Hands) as *no valid one*. And I thought I had *Stapleton* to warrant me, in his Second Concluſion, [m] *That Impoſition of Hands is to be by Biſhops only, and is* invalid *if by any others, Presbyters or Laicks*. Where he ſuppoſes that there may be Impoſition of Hands in fact by Preſbyters or Laicks, and is content to ſay that it is *invalid* and null; but does not ſay that it is both Impoſition of Hands (as he ſuppoſes it to be) in fact, and no Impoſition of Hands at all, that is, none in fact. But we muſt ſubmit to better Inſtruction, if the *Remarker* be in the right: And he himſelf appears to think ſo, that the Want of Biſhops Hands makes it not only *no valid* Impoſition of Hands, but *none at all*. Upon this Sub-

[k] Ch. 5. §. 2, 3. [l] P. 69. [m] Sup. p. 281.

tilty he proceeds, and interprets it to be a Denial of the [m] *Fact* of the Ordination of our Biſhops, that the Author, in the *Promptuarium*, *affirms their Ordination was null upon this Account*, *That they had no* Epiſcopal *Impoſition of Hands from any* true Biſhops; and makes no more of it, after he has *delivered at large* the Place in the Diſcourſe from the Goſpel on St. *Mark*'s Day (in one Part whereof *Stapleton* ſays of our Biſhops, *A nemine manûs impoſitionem accipiebant*, They had Impoſition of Hands from *none*) but that the Reſult of the Diſcourſe is, [n] That *he affirms our Pretended Biſhops had no true Ordination, upon* this Account, *becauſe they had no Impoſition of Hands from any* Biſhop. And the like Uſe he makes of his Words to *Horne*, cited before [o], that he ſays, [p] *They had no Ordination at* all; *none but from the* Queen's Patents; *none from any* Biſhop. That the Author, in theſe and a great many other Places, charges our Prelates *only* with the Want of *Epiſcopal* Impoſition of Hands, I agree with him; but that in this Charge he denies the *Fact* of their Ordinations, he muſt give me leave not to allow, tho' he may think himſelf clear in the Point. Accordingly, he makes his ſaying (in the Diſcourſe in the *Promptuarium*) That *they had no Impoſition of Hands from any Biſhop* [q] *inconſiſtent with* Stapleton's *having any Knowledge of the* Lambeth *Account*; that is, the Report of the Fact of their Ordination in the *Lambeth* Regiſter. And ſays farther, [r] that *it would be impertinent and ſilly for him to affirm, that they were not ordained by any Biſhop, if his Adverſaries could juſtly reply, as,* he ſays, *they might if the* Lambeth *Account were true, that they were ordained by Biſhops.* So that the Diſpute about the Truth of the *Lambeth* Regiſter, and the Fact of the Or-

[m] P. 70. [n] P. 71. [o] Sup. p. 267. [p] P. 72.
[q] P. 71. [r] P. 71, 72.

dinations, is the ſame, in his Judgment, as Whether they were ordained by true Biſhops.

I need not argue with the Author of the *Remarks*, from his pretending to follow and [f] *explain* F. *L. Quien*, which he does, I muſt ſay, in the ſame manner as *Parſons*'s *Preface*r, and *Fitz-Simon* follow and explain *Sacroboſco*, that is, gives him up and ſets him aſide; for ſo it is, for him to make no more of *Stapleton*'s Words, than that he denies our Biſhops having Impoſition of *Biſhops* Hands, after he had ſeen that *Le Quien* interprets his Words, in ſo many Places, to mean nothing leſs than a Denial of their having *any* Impoſition of Hands *whatſoever*; any Uſe of that Ceremony at all in their Ordination. It may be ſaid that the *Father* has no Reaſon to be diſpleaſed with his *Second*; becauſe he himſelf, tho' he takes upon him to prove that the Author denies any Impoſition of Hands *at all*, yet all the Proof he brings of it, from ſo many Places, comes to no more than that he denies *Epiſcopal* Impoſition of Hands: And this might give the *Remarker* the unhappy Turn of thinking, that no Impoſition of *Biſhops* Hands, and no Impoſition of Hands *at all*, are the ſame thing.

But it may be of more Importance to try, if I can clear up to the *Remarker*'s Apprehenſion, the true State of the Diſpute about the Fact of the Ordinations; which I muſt, till I am better informed, take to be, "Whether our firſt Biſhops "were in fact ordained by thoſe Perſons, and by "that Form and Order, as the Account in the "*Lambeth* Regiſter relates they were:" And the Queſtion about the Validity and Lawfulneſs of the Ordinations to be, "Whether the Perſons "from whom they received Impoſition of Hands "for Ordination, were ſuch as had Authority to

[f] P. 72.

" give them a valid and lawful Call to the Order;
" and the Form ſufficient in itſelf, and autho-
" rized by the Laws of Church and State, to
" make them true and lawful Biſhops?" To ſhew that, in regard to the Perſons, this is the true State of the Queſtion, I need only aſk the *Remarker*, What is it that makes an Ordination valid and lawful in that regard? Is it not its being performed by the *Proper Miniſters*, and a competent Number of them, by ſuch Perſons as have Authority to ordain Biſhops, Prieſts, and Deacons; that is, by *true Biſhops?* And, What makes an Ordination invalid and unlawful, but its being performed by others who are not the *Proper Miniſters*; that is, by Laymen, Deacons, or Presbyters, who have no Authority to ordain for want of the Epiſcopal Order? If then there may be *in fact* ſuch a Sort of Ordination, where the Perſons of the Ordainers are no more than Laicks, Deacons, or Presbyters, and this Ordination is not valid, for want of their being true Biſhops; what muſt we think of the Diſcovery in this Writer, that to have no Ordination or Impoſition of Hands by Biſhops, is to have *not only no valid* Ordination or Impoſition of Hands, but no Ordination or Impoſition of Hands *in fact*, none *at all?* By what appears of this Author's writing with ſo great Aſſurance, and treating thoſe who differ from him, the *Librarian*, and the [t] *unfortunate* Arch-Biſhop *Bramhall*, with Contempt, we muſt believe that he looks upon himſelf as very ſufficient and equal to the Work he takes in hand, *viz.* to prove the *Lambeth* Regiſter to be incredible; but when we come to take a near View of his Performance, we find he is ſo little qualified and prepared for the Diſpute, as not to underſtand ſo much as the true State of the Queſtion. Otherwiſe he

[t] P. 93, 94, 161, 166, 205.

would

would not confound the Point of Right or Validity with the Point of Fact, and pretend to prove that *Harding* and *Stapleton* deny that our Biſhops had any Conſecrators at all, or thoſe Conſecrators who are named in the *Lambeth* Regiſter, from their Denial that they had any true Biſhops for their Conſecrators. If this be a good Proof of his Point, he is very happy in a compleat Victory, becauſe he can have no Adverſaries on our Side; not any I mean that have read and conſidered thoſe two *Writers*, nothing being more evident than that they both deny our firſt Biſhops to have been conſecrated by true Biſhops. It muſt be owned, that the *Remarker* attempts to diſprove the Truth of the Regiſter from *Barlow* and *Hodgskins*'s not being *Parker*'s Conſecrators, which if he could ſhew from *Harding* or *Stapleton*, it muſt be granted that they deny the Truth of the Regiſter; but the Way wherein he attempts to ſhew it is very particular and ſurprizing, That from their Teſtimonies it appears [v] *they muſt have known* either that *Barlow* and *Hodgskins* were no true Biſhops, or that they were not *Parker*'s Conſecrators; his Words are, *that either they were never truly conſecrated, or that they did not perform the Conſecration of* Parker. Here we ſee no poſitive Proof of either, that they were not true Biſhops, or that they were not *Parker*'s Conſecrators; but an extraordinary Way of concluding, only in the *diſjunctive*, that they were either the one or the other. And we might be at a Loſs for the Author's Meaning, if we had not ſome Light from his State of the Queſtion, which ſhews his Argument to be a formidable *Dilemma*, whereby, take which Side we pleaſe, he looks upon it that we muſt grant the *Lambeth* Regiſter to be falſe; falſe, if *Barlow* and *Hodgskins* were not two of *Parker*'s Conſecra-

[v] P. 58, 59, 61, 71.

tors; and falſe likewiſe as he ſtates the Point, on the other Side, if they were not true Biſhops. Unhappy for the Biſhops and Clergy of the Church of *England*, that they were not left rather only to *Le Quien*'s Mercy; but muſt beſides be attacked here at Home, by ſo *ſmart* a Diſputant!

It might be pretended that the Regiſter gives *Barlow* and the reſt of *Parker*'s Conſecrators the Title of Biſhops; conſequently, if they were not *true Biſhops* the Regiſter is falſe in giving them the *Title*. This Pretence I ſhall not ſtay to conſider now; but give an Anſwer to it, when I come to an Argument of F. *Le Quien*'s againſt the Regiſter, from *Harding*'s ſaying that *Jewell* had not three Biſhops at his Conſecration; where it will appear that the *Father* plainly forgets his own State of the Point in diſpute; and may have given his *Follower* another Occaſion of returning into, or perſiſting in, the ſame fundamental Miſtake, and taking upon him to diſprove the Truth and Credibility of our Regiſter, without underſtanding in what Particular he was to diſprove it.

The time of Stapleton's *writing the* Relectio, &c. *proves that he then knew nothing of the* Nag's-Head *Story.*

15. I have nothing more to add in this Chapter, but only to obſerve to the Reader the *time* of *Stapleton*'s declaring againſt our Ordinations and Miniſtry, in the Part of his Work laſt cited, the *Relectio Principiorum Doctrinalium*. It was written by him ſo late as in the Year 1596. ſo little before the End of that *Century*; at the very time, we may reaſonably conceive, when *Conſtable*[w] was writing his *Anſwer* to the *Enquiries about the Vocation and Conſecration of our Biſhops*; and within ſeven Years of the time when [x] *Sacroboſco* publiſhed in Print a particular and pretty full Account of

[w] Sup. p. 69. [x] Sup. ibid.

the

the *Nag's-Head* Ordination. In the ſame Year 1596. the Author was engaged in Controverſy, as he had been before, with *Whitaker*, whom he tells in his *Triplicatio*, " [y] Pulſis univerſis Catholicis Epiſ- " copis—— intruſi ſunt alii ſine ullâ manuum " impoſitione, ſine ullâ legitimâ aut ordinatione " aut ſucceſſione, ex ſolâ Principis voluntate, " qui ſe pro Epiſcopis gererent." *Every one of the Catholick Biſhops being ejected, others were thruſt in to take upon them the Office of Biſhops, without any Impoſition of Hands, without either any* lawful *Ordination or Succeſſion*, by no other Authority but *only from the Will of the Prince.* Here he ſpeaks in as high Terms as in any Place that we have had before, and much in the ſame Strain as formerly, when he told *Horne*, That *he was called to his Function only by the Letters Patents of the* Prince, *without* due *Conſecration or Impoſition of Hands from any* Biſhop. And he might there, as here, have added, *without any* lawful *Succeſſion*; *Horne* being, in his (as well as in *Bonner*'s) Opinion, an [z] *Uſurper*, and *Intruder*, and *Unlawful Poſſeſſioner of the Biſhoprick of* Wincheſter. But will any thing of what he ſays here to *Whitaker*, and the ſame Year in the *Relectio Principiorum*, come up to that which could not but be expected from him at this time? Had he not in ſo many Years as from 1565. to 1596. heard of our Biſhops being made at the *Tavern* by ſuch an Act of Sacriledge and Prophaneneſs? When he engaged in Defence of *Fecknam* againſt *Horne*, *Ann.* 1567. it muſt be ſuppoſed that he held a Correſpondence with that *Abbot*, who was one of the [a] *Men of Note of the ancient Clergy, in whoſe Time, and in whoſe Sight, as a Man may ſay*, we have it from *Champney*, that *the Matter* of the *Nag's-Head*

[y] Op. T. 1. p. 1259.
[z] Strype's Ann. Vol. 1. p. 341.
[a] Sup. p. 19.

Conſecra-

Conſecration *was done:* And if it was, it is hard to conceive that, if no Body elſe, the *Abbot* at leaſt ſhould not give Intelligence of it to ſo good a Friend, in order to his making it publick in the *Counterblaſt*. But if *Stapleton* failed of hearing of it from *Fecknam* then; ſure, when Biſhop *Watſon* and he came to be Fellow-Priſoners with *Bluet*, and the other *Confeſſors*, in the *Caſtle* at *Wisbich* [b], *Ann.* 1580. and they were all ſo fully poſſeſſed with the Belief of the Fact, from *Neale*'s Relation of it in their hearing; they muſt all have agreed to tranſmit the Story to one whoſe Pen was never idle, when there was an Occaſion of publiſhing any Scandal againſt the *Reformed* Church of *England*; from whom it would certainly have been proclaimed, if not before, in his *Promptuarium*, *Ann.* 1588. and Inſtructions given to the Catholick Preachers to publiſh it from the Pulpit every St. *Andrew*'s and St. *Mark*'s Day, and at other times when the Goſpels ſuggeſted to them Matter of Declamation upon the Want of true Orders in the Proteſtant Clergy. But the Author, we find, is wholly ſilent, both then and when the Report from *Neale* muſt come, *Ann.* 1596. to be farther divulged among the Party: And we have good Grounds to conclude from his Silence, that either he had not heard, even ſo late, any Rumour, or Murmurings, or Whiſpers of ſuch a Fact, or if he had, he knew better how our Biſhops were actually conſecrated, as will ſoon appear from his own Words, and was ſo wiſe as not to give Countenance to a lying Fable, at the Hazard of his own Reputation.

[b] Strype's Annals, Vol. 1. p. 463.

CHAP.

CHAP. VIII.

The Counterblaſt *to* Horne *ſhews that* Stapleton *never called in queſtion the* Fact *of the Ordinations of our Biſhops. His Objection in the* Preface *againſt the Legality of their Ordinations ſhews that he owns they were ordained by King* Edward's *Form. His Objections in the firſt Chapter.* Le Quien's *pretended Proof from thence of his Denial that they were conſecrated by King* Edward's *Form. The Author, by what he makes him ſay, muſt be guilty of a double Self-Contradiction.* Le Quien's *Attempt to evade one of theſe Contradictions. His Evaſion diſproved from the Author's Words and Deſign in his Preface. His Diſtinction to clear* Stapleton *from that Self-Contradiction diſproved from our Hiſtory and Conſtitution. The Author, by* Le Quien's *Account of him, guilty of another Self-Contradiction. And of a third. The Proof from the* Counterblaſt, *That* Stapleton *declares our Biſhops were conſecrated by King* Edward's *Ordinal, ſhews that there can be no Ground from any other Places of his Works to pretend that he denies they were ſo conſecrated. It ſhews alſo, from* his Authority, *that the other* Writers *of his time muſt either have no other Meaning, or that what they ſay muſt be falſe. The* Remarker's *Allegation, from the* Anſwer *to the Book entituled* Engliſh Juſtice, *to prove that the Biſhops were not conſecrated by* their own New

New Ordinal, *confutes itſelf. What* Stapleton *ſays in Relation to the Caſe between* Bonner *and* Horne *implies no more than is conſiſtent with his owning that our Biſhops were conſecrated by King* Edward's *Form.* Summary *of what is ſaid in this and the former Chapter relating to his* Teſtimony.

Stapleton's Counterblaſt ſhews that he never called in queſtion the Fact of our Biſhops Ordinations.

1. WHAT has been ſaid in the former Chapter ſhews that *Stapleton* in none of the Places cited there, can with good Reaſon be pretended to deny the *Fact* of the Ordinations of our firſt Biſhops, or to diſprove the Truth of the *Lambeth* Regiſter; much leſs to be a Witneſs for the Truth of the *Counter-Ordination* at the *Nag's-Head.* That which follows will, I hope, prove him to be a ſubſtantial Evidence for the Truth of the *Lambeth* Account, and an utter Stranger to the oppoſite Story. This we ſhall find where we might otherwiſe have the leaſt Reaſon to expect it, in his *Counterblaſt* to *Horne*; againſt whom he appeared in Defence of *Fecknam* the Deprived *Abbot* of *Weſtminſter*, and in the Entrance upon his Work in the firſt Chapter, declares that the *Abbot* had ſhewed *Horne* greater Civility and Reſpect than his *Pert Young Second* could allow himſelf to do. *Fecknam* had given *Horne* the Title of *Biſhop* of *Wincheſter*; but *Stapleton* thinks fit to deny him both the *Order* and the *Name* of Biſhop. We may therefore look for very ſtrong Reaſons in this *Work*, to *un-biſhop* that Prelate, and all his *Collegues*, as the Author calls them; and ſome of theſe Reaſons we have in the Preface, and the firſt Chapter. In the Preface he objects againſt their Ordinations in theſe Words: "Again in the firſt "Year of our gracious Queen the Act of Parlia-"ment, for making and conſecrating of Biſhops,

"made

" made in the twenty eighth (it ſhould be the " twenty fifth) Year of King *Henry*, was *revived*. " And yet the Biſhops were ordered not accord- " ing to the Act, but according to an Act made " in King *Edward*'s Days, and repealed by Queen " *Mary*, and *not revived* in the ſaid firſt Year." *Le Quien* [a] has part of the Words in *Latin*, but I tranſcribe the whole from the Tranſlation in the Author's Works: " [b] Hoc etiam obſervan- " dum eſt, quod primo anno noſtræ Sereniſſimæ " Principis *Elizabethæ* Lex Parliamentaria quæ " 28° *Henrici*, de creatione & conſecratione E- " piſcoporum, lata fuit, iterum revixit & reno- " vata fuit. Et tamen Epiſcopi non ſecundum " illam Legem, ſed ſecundum alteram *Edvardi*, " eamque *Mariâ* regnante *abrogatam*, & nondum " ab *Elizabethâ reſtauratam*, inſtituebantur." The *Father* [c] owns this Paſſage in the Preface had eſcaped him, ſo that he does not produce it before the *Additions* at the End of his firſt Tome; but himſelf beſt knows whether he ever ſaw it before, and conſidered it well, which if he had done in time, he might have ſaved himſelf the Trouble of all his other Allegations from *Stapleton*, as well as from *Bonner*, *Harding*, *&c.* The Author, by what he ſays in this Part of his Preface, of *our Biſhops being made according to the Act* of Parliament *made in King* Edward's *Days*, cannot mean any thing elſe but their being conſecrated by the Form appointed by the Ordinal eſtabliſhed in Parliament by that King; and it is plain that he declares their Ordinations by that Form to be illegal, becauſe King *Edward*'s *Act* whereby it was introduced *had been repealed by Queen* Mary, *and not revived by Queen* Elizabeth, at her firſt Acceſſion to the Throne. And upon

His Objection in the Preface *againſt the Legality of their Ordinations ſhews that he owns they were ordained by King* Edward's *Form.*

[a] T. 1. Addit. p. i, ii. [b] T. 2. p. 828. [c] T. 1. Addit. p. 1.

the

the like Ground he declares they could not be legally ordained but only by the *Roman* Pontifical; that Form being required by *Stat.* 25 *Hen* VIII. and that Statute, though it had been *repealed by Queen* Mary, *having been revived by Queen* Elizabeth, *in the Beginning of her Reign.* There cannot be a clearer Proof than this, that *Stapleton*, tho' he objects the *Illegality* of it, yet confeſſes the *Fact* of the Biſhops having been conſecrated by that Form: And if that Form was not without the proper *Solemnity*, and *Ceremony*, and in particular the Ceremony of *Impoſition of Hands*, how ſhall we make this Declaration of *Stapleton*'s conſiſtent with the Account that *Le Quien* pretends to give us upon his Authority? much leſs with the Author's having any Knowledge of the Ordination at the *Nag's-Head*, or of any other but that which is related in the *Lambeth* Regiſter?

His Objections in the firſt Chapter.

2. But we are to proceed to what he ſays of the Ordination of *Horne*, *&c.* in the firſt Chapter of his Work. His firſt Reaſon there to deny *Horne* his Title, and to declare him to be *No Biſhop*, is, "[d] Becauſe his Vocation was directly contrary to "the Canons and Conſtitutions of the Catholick "Church, and to the univerſal Cuſtom and Manner practiſed heretofore, not only in *England*, "but in all other Catholick Countries and "Churches." He inſtances in one Particular wherein he wanted the accuſtomed Vocation, that he had not the *Pope's Confirmation*, which *every Biſhop of* Wincheſter, he ſays, *had before his Proteſtant Predeceſſor* Poynet; and concludes, that therefore he is *No Biſhop at all*, *having not any good and accuſtomable Vocation or Conſecration.* This can be no Proof of the Author's denying any

[d] Counterblaſt to Horne, chap. 1. p. 7. Staplet. Op. T. 2. p. 838, 839.

more

more than the Lawfulneſs of his Call and Ordination: And *Le Quien* [e] owns that it comes not home to his Point, but refers us to that which is to come afterwards, wherein the Author *goes farther*, whoſe Words I ſhall ſet down, after I have given the Reader a Sight of his ſecond Reaſon, and left him to read what follows before the Argument which *Le Quien* looks upon as deciſive. In the ſecond place, *Stapleton* tells *Horne*, That tho' his Vocation had been lawful, yet he had rendered himſelf uncapable by his Marriage, which together with his other Hereſies, made him undoubtedly an Heretick. He ſays below, that there being then no *Act of Parliament to confirm his Marriage, the Canon Law ſtanding in Force* makes him *no true Biſhop*. But this can touch only the Lawfulneſs of his Ordination, and holding his Biſhoprick. The Reader may, if he pleaſes, entertain himſelf with the Author's occaſional Reflections, upon that married Biſhop for carrying his *Madge* about with him; and upon *Cranmer*, for carrying his *Nobs in a Cheſt bored with Holes*; and his bringing in the *Jeſt* upon the *Lollards*, of *Down Pig, and up Pike*; (which might have come in more to the Purpoſe, if he had been ſpeaking, as *Parſon*'s [f] *Prefacer*, of *Scory*'s making our Prelates fall *down Prieſts*, and riſe *up Biſhops*) and laſtly, his Tale of a *pretty* Trick of *Legerdemain*, which *Le Quien* [g] charitably interprets of a *Forgery* of the Governours of the Church in King *Edward*'s time, and their *falſifying an Act of Parliament relating to Tranſubſtantiation and the Adoration of the Hoſt*.

Such Digreſſions from his Subject ſhew that the *Writer* had Time, and Leiſure, and a very good Inclination, to have publiſhed the Account of the Mock-Conſecration, if it had come to his Ears.

[e] T. 1. p. 266. [f] Sup. p. 10, 11, 89. [g] T. 1. p. 400, 401.

But

Le Quien's pretended Proof of his Denial that our Biſhops were conſecrated by the Ordinal.

But I paſs on to the Proof which *Le Quien* promiſed us, of our Biſhops not being conſecrated by King *Edward*'s Ordinal. The Words, as he has them from the *Tranſlator*, are, "[h] QUIS NESCIT "te tuoſque Collegas non dico aliter quam re- "quirunt Canones, ſed nec ſecundum præſcrip- "tum *Statutorum veſtrorum* ordinatos eſſe." In the Original they are, "[i] Is it not notorious that "you and your Collegues were not ordained ac- "cording to the Preſcript, I will not ſay of the "Church, but of the *very Statutes.*" Here it is that *Le Quien* [k] aſſures us that the Author ſays, "*It is publick and notorious that not only* Horne "*had no lawful and canonical Vocation, but that* "*he had not ſo much as the Conſecration preſcribed* "*by the* Laws *of the* Realm, *and authorized by the* "new *Church of* England: *Which*, he ſays, *is* "*the ſame as to reproach him for having no Ordi-* "*nation at all.*"

3. It muſt be confeſſed that *Stapleton* denies *that* Horne *was ordained according to the Preſcript of the* very Statutes; but what Statutes he means does not at all appear from the Words. The Tranſlator, inſtead of *ipſorum Statutorum*, has it *veſtrorum*; and this may look as if by this Expreſſion *your own* Statutes, were meant the Statutes of a *Prince of your own*, a *Proteſtant* Prince, King *Edward* VI. But may not the Words, the *very Statutes* (or even *our own Statutes*) be meant of the *Stat.* 25 *Hen.* VIII. if that Statute were then in force? Or is it poſſible that the Author ſhould mean, not King *Henry*'s Statute relating to the making of our Biſhops, but King *Edward*'s; when he had juſt before ſaid expreſly, that King *Henry*'s Statute was revived and authorized by

[h] T. 1. p. 263. Staplet. Op. T. 2. p. 839, 840.
[i] Counterblaſt, c. 1. p. 9. [k] T. 1. p. 267.

Queen

Queen *Elizabeth*, in her firſt Parliament; but King *Edward*'s was not then revived, and conſequently had not any Authority or Force of a Statute? *Le Quien* upon this Occaſion puts us in mind that Dr. *Stapleton* was (he means by *Bramhall*'s Confeſſion) [1] *the moſt Judicious and Rational of the* Engliſh *Papiſts*; and can the *Father* then make him guilty of two ſuch Self-Contradictions as he does here? He had ſaid in the *Preface*, that King *Edward*'s Statute for the Uſe of his Ordinal was *not revived* by Queen *Elizabeth* in her firſt Year: But within ſo little Diſtance as the firſt Chapter of the *Counterblaſt*, *Le Quien* makes him ſay that the ſame Statute *was revived*, and in full Force; that is, that our Biſhops were not ordained *according to the Preſcript of the Statutes*, becauſe they were not ordained by the Form in the Ordinal *preſcribed by that Statute*. If King *Edward*'s Act of Parliament for the Uſe of the Ordinal was *not revived*, it muſt not then have any Place in the Body of the Statutes then in force; nor could it have the Authority of a Law of the Land, to preſcribe how our Biſhops and Clergy ſhould be ordained; nor could they be obliged to be ordained by the *Preſcript* of that, which, tho' it once had been, yet was at that time *No Statute*. This muſt be the Author's Meaning, when he ſays that *Act had been* repealed *by Queen* Mary, *and not* revived *by Queen* Elizabeth: For after that Repeal, without a Revival, it muſt be really no Act of Parliament, any more than any former Acts that were *expired*. Could it then be his Meaning that the Biſhops were ordained contrary to Law for not obſerving the Preſcript of that Act, without contradicting himſelf, and ſaying that the ſame Act (tho' not *revived*) was reſtored to the Authority it had before, and had the Force

The Author, by what Le Quien *pretends to make him ſay, muſt be guilty of a double Self-Contradiction.*

[1] T. 1. p. 260, 264

of Law, as much as ever in King *Edward*'s time. This is the firſt Self-Contradiction, That the Author ſays that King *Edward*'s Statute was *not revived*, and yet *was revived*. The other appears to be as plain and expreſs, That he ſays, in the *Preface*, that *the Biſhops were conſecrated* by the Form in King *Edward*'s Ordinal, and preſently after, in the *Counterblaſt*, that they *were not conſecrated by* that Form; for ſo it muſt be, if he ſays firſt that their Ordination was illegal becauſe they *were conſecrated* according to the *Act* that preſcribed the Uſe of that Form, and then ſays afterwards, that their Ordination was contrary to *the Preſcript of the Statutes*, becauſe they were *not conſecrated* according to the *Act* that preſcribed that Form.

LeQuien's *Attempt to evade one of theſe Contradictions.*

It does not appear that F. *Le Quien* was ſenſible of the firſt Self-Contradiction, but he takes ſome Pains to evade the other, and to ſhew in what different reſpects his Author does firſt affirm and afterwards deny, That our Biſhops were conſecrated by that Form. His Ground for it is his Diſcovery in point of Hiſtory, ſpoken of before[m], upon which he tells us, There were *two Claſſes* of the Biſhops made in the firſt Part of Queen *Elizabeth*'s Reign; the one, of *Parker*, and three or four more of her firſt Nomination; the other, of ſuch Biſhops as were made after the Convocation, *Ann.* 1562. Of the latter Claſs, he pretends it is that *Stapleton* ſays in the *Preface*, that they *were* conſecrated by King *Edward*'s Form; and of the former, in the *Counterblaſt*, that they were *not* conſecrated by that Form. This Diſtinction the *Father* looks upon to be ſufficient to reconcile the Author to himſelf, becauſe, tho' he does affirm and deny the ſame thing, he does not contradict himſelf, inaſmuch as he ſpeaks of different

[m] Sup. p. 176, 182. Le Quien, T. 1. Add. p. ii, iii.

Perſons,

Perſons, conſecrated at different Times. But it will ſoon appear that this Diſtinction is much more groundleſs and frivolous than *Le Quien*[n] had Reaſon to think ours whereby we attempt to *elude* the Force of their Allegations from *Stapleton* and *Harding*, and the reſt of their Writers. And to prove this, I ſhall ſhew that it is inconſiſtent, firſt with the Author's Deſign in what he ſays in the *Preface* to the *Counterblaſt*; ſecondly, with his Words there in ſeveral Particulars; thirdly, with the Truth of our Hiſtory and Conſtitution.

His Evaſion diſproved from the Author's Deſign in the Preface.

4. Firſt, It will not be poſſible to conceive that *Stapleton* had any Thought of ſuch a Diſtinction, if we look back into his *Preface*, and conſider the Deſign of what he ſays there. It is [o] to ſhew the fatal Conſequences in *Chriſtendom* that followed (according to his Judgment) upon the renouncing of the Supremacy of the Biſhop of *Rome*; how in all Places where his Power was laid aſide, the State of Religion, after that Innovation, degenerated from bad to worſe; for inſtance, in the *Grecian* and *African* Churches, in *Bohemia*, *Germany*, *Hungary*, and *Lithuania*, and here at home with us in *England*; where he ſays, tho' during the Life of King *Henry* the *Eighth*, the Doctrines of the *Roman* Church were kept up after his aboliſhing the Pope's Power, yet preſently after his Deceaſe, in his Son King *Edward*'s Reign, a *New Religion* was introduced, and this New Religion was reſtored again by Queen *Elizabeth*; but with ſome pretty great *Difference*, ſtill for the *worſe*. His Inſtances of ſuch Differences between the State of Religion in King *Edward*'s time and Queen *Elizabeth*'s firſt Part of her Reign are, That firſt, [p] the Biſhops and Clergy in King

[n] T. 1. p. 282. [o] Op. T. 2. p. 828, 829. [p] T. 2. p. 828.

Edward's time were many of them married, but they had then ſome Pretence and Encouragement from an Act of Parliament paſſed in that Reign, allowing them to marry; whereas under Queen *Elizabeth* they married and kept their Wives, tho' the Laws not only of God and the Church, but of the Realm were againſt them. Secondly, In King *Edward*'s Reign a New Ordinal was eſtabliſhed by Act of Parliament, whereby his Biſhops were conſecrated; but in the firſt Year of Queen *Elizabeth* King *Henry*'s Statute, which preſcribed the Uſe of the Pontifical, was revived, and yet the Biſhops were conſecrated, not by the Pontifical, but the New Ordinal, tho' the Act whereby that was introduced in King *Edward*'s time, had been repealed by Queen *Mary*, and was not revived by Queen *Elizabeth* in her firſt Year. This is all the Difference that *Stapleton* pretends to make between the Way of King *Edward*'s Biſhops and the Biſhops in the Beginning of Queen *Elizabeth*'s Reign, coming into their Biſhopricks. And could a Man of any Judgment or common Senſe, much leſs one of *Stapleton*'s Character, if he knew of theſe two different Sets of Queen *Elizabeth*'s firſt Biſhops, and how they came into their Sees, could he, when he was ſhewing, in this Particular, how much the Caſe was altered for the worſe under that Queen, from what it had been in King *Edward*'s Reign, have paſſed over ſo ſurprizing a Difference between the Ordination of King *Edward*'s Biſhops, and the Way wherein the firſt Set of Biſhops under the Queen, *Parker*, *Grindall*, and (*Stapleton*'s Adverſary) *Horne*, *&c.* were inveſted in their Biſhopricks; that the former had a Conſecration by the Form in King *Edward*'s Ordinal, but *Parker* and his Brethren had no Sort of *Ordination at all*, no *Impoſition of Hands*, but came into their Sees only *by vertue of the Queen's Letters Patents?* Could he ſatisfy himſelf with

with reflecting only upon the latter Set of Biſhops after *Parker* and *Horne*, *&c.* that they were conſecrated by King *Edward*'s Ordinal, without any legal Eſtabliſhment of it, ſuch as it had in King *Edward*'s time? Was it not eaſy, nay, unavoidable, for him to ſtate the Difference thus? "King "*Edward*'s Biſhops were ordained by his Ordi- "nal, at that time eſtabliſhed by Law; but for "the Biſhops in the Beginning of the Queen's "Reign, *Parker*, and *Horne*, and others of the "firſt of them, before the Year 1562. had no "Ordination at all, neither by the *Roman* Ponti- "fical, nor King *Edward*'s Ordinal, but were "made *without any Solemnity*, *without any Ceremo-* "*ny*; by no Authority but of the Queen's No- "mination by her *Letters Patents*; and the reſt "that were made Biſhops afterwards, between "the Years 1562. and 1566. were ordained indeed "with the Ceremony of King *Edward*'s Ordinal, "but (beſides that their Conſecrators were *Par-* "*ker*, *Grindal*, *&c.* who had themſelves no Or- "dination at all) the Ordinal by which they were "conſecrated had not, before their Conſecration, "been re-eſtabliſhed by Act of Parliament." If we go farther, and ſuppoſe it was notoriouſly known, to *Stapleton* and every Body elſe, that the firſt Set, *Parker*, *&c.* had no Ordination but from *Scory* at the *Nag's-Head* Tavern; can it be imagined that *Stapleton* ſhould let ſlip the Opportunity of ſhewing how much the Caſe was altered infinitely for the worſe, between the Biſhops in King *Edward*'s time, and the Queen's firſt Biſhops? "That the former were conſecrated in a *Church* "or *Chapel*, with all the decent *Solemnities* of "Religion that were retained in King *Edward*'s "Ordinal; but *Parker* and his Brethren were "made Biſhops in a *Tavern*, in a profane and ſa- "crilegious Manner?" Could he have forborne to expoſe theſe Biſhops, when his Subject ſo plain-

ly called upon him to lay open the Nakedneſs of the *Engliſh* Proteſtant Church and Clergy in this Particular?

Diſproof of Le Quien's *Evaſion from the Author's Words in the Preface.*

5. This appears from the Author's *Deſign* in what he ſays in the Preface. The ſame thing, ſecondly, is very plain from his Words there. After the Objection that they were made by King *Edward*'s Act, *not revived*, he ſays immediately; *And if they will ſay that that Defect* (the Want, he means, of Authority in the Form eſtabliſhed by that Act) *is now ſupplied* (by an Act of Parliament paſſed *Ann.* 1566. the Year before) *let them remember that they are but Parliament and No Church Biſhops.* Here again, if he knew the State of the Caſe to be ſuch as *Le Quien* ſays he knew it to be, what could make him ſo favourable in his Judgment of it? He obſerves that to what he had objected, that the Biſhops were conſecrated by an Ordinal that had not yet any legal Eſtabliſhment, it might be anſwered that the Ordinal was lately confirmed by an Act of Parliament paſſed the laſt Year, 8 *Eliz.* and the Biſhops that had been conſecrated by it were declared by that Act to be true and legal Biſhops; and his Reply is, *Yet ſtill they could be no more than Parliamentary Biſhops.* But had he not the Senſe to reply, "True, this "might ſerve the Turn of thoſe laſt Biſhops, "who were conſecrated by the Ordinal after the "Year 1562. but of what Service could it be to "*Parker*, and the reſt of the Biſhops that were "made before, who were not conſecrated either "by the *Pontifical* or the *New Ordinal*, but by "no Ceremonial except that which was uſed at "the *Tavern?* It could not make theſe Men Bi"ſhops of the Church, nay, nor ſo much as *Par*"*liament Biſhops*, becauſe that Parliament con"firmed none elſe but ſuch as had been conſe"crated by the Ordinal." Let *Le Quien* or any Body

Body elſe look upon *Stapleton*'s Preface, and conſider the Words and Deſign of it, and ſay whether he could have ſpoken otherwiſe than I have ſhewed he muſt have ſpoken, if he had known that *Parker* and *Horne*, *&c.* were made Biſhops in the Manner that *Le Quien* pretends, a Manner ſo very different from, and contrary to, the Ordination of the Biſhops in King *Edward*'s time.

The Author's Words in the Preface will give us ſtill farther Light to ſee how groundleſs this Diſtinction is; *Stapleton* there firſt objects againſt the Ordination of our Biſhops the Non-re-eſtabliſhment of the Ordinal; then he owns that this Defect was taken away by the Parliament 8 *Eliz.* which made them, tho' they were not ſo before, *Parliament Biſhops.* I would aſk who, of all Queen *Elizabeth*'s Biſhops, had the Favour done him by that Parliament, to take off this Defect in his Ordination? Could it be any other than *Horne* in the firſt place, the Legality of whoſe Ordination was called in queſtion upon that Account by *Bonner* and his Counſel; and the Bill was brought in, on purpoſe to put an End to the Diſpute? If the Perſon was *Horne*, then he was one of the Biſhops that *Stapleton* ſpeaks of, who were confirmed by that Parliament: One of thoſe who he affirms were conſecrated by the New Ordinal of King *Edward*, tho' his Statute for it had been repealed and not revived. And if this be the Author's Meaning in his *Preface*, how is it poſſible for him to have a Meaning plainly contradictory to it, when he ſays in the *Counterblaſt*, that Horne *and his Collegues were not conſecrated according to the Preſcript of the Statutes?* that is, as *Le Quien* underſtands it, that they were not conſecrated at all by the New Ordinal.

The very Reaſon that *Stapleton* gives *why*, tho' they were confirmed by Parliament, yet *they were but Parliament and no Church or Catholick*

Biſhops, proves farther that he meant that thoſe Biſhops, *Horne* in particular, had been conſecrated by the Ordinal; his Reaſon is that *they were ordered in ſuch a Manner and Faſhion as no Catholick Church ever uſed*; what can this mean but King *Edward*'s Ordinal, the Uncanonicalneſs of which was ſtill to be charged upon them, tho' the Parliament had made it legal, becauſe it was a Form that had never been uſed in any (of *Stapleton*'s) *Catholick Churches?*

LeQuien's Diſtinction to clear his Author from Self-Contradiction diſproved from our Hiſtory and Conſtitution.

6. Enough has been ſaid to ſhew from the Words and Deſign of the Preface, that *Le Quien*, if he had read his Author *Stapleton* with a Deſign to inform himſelf of his true Meaning, muſt have found there was no Poſſibility of putting that Gloſs upon his Text, without making him guilty of contradicting himſelf; and that the *Salvo* he had found out to clear his Author from a Contradiction (the Diſtinction among our firſt Biſhops, which he pretends the Author was aware of) was utterly unknown to him, and inconſiſtent with what he ſays. He might, thirdly, have ſeen as evidently the Ridiculouſneſs of ſuch a Diſtinction, if he had thought it worth his while to be well informed of our Hiſtory and Conſtitution. For would he not have been aſhamed to tell the World that the Biſhops that were made before the Convocation, *Ann.* 1562. had no Conſecration at all, as the others after them had, if he had known (as he might eaſily) that not only *Parker* and a few more were made Biſhops, but that there were Proteſtant Biſhops placed in all the Sees except two, and the whole Bench almoſt filled up, before the Meeting of that Convocation; as has been ſhewed before [q], from the Account we have of the Biſhops that met in that Convocation, and

[q] Sup. p. 178, 179.

thoſe

thoſe that ſubſcribed the Articles, and the Spiritual Peers who attended the Parliament at the ſame time. Would he have ventured to ſuggeſt that ſo great a Number of the Biſhops as were made before that Convocation were ordained not at *Lambeth* but the *Nag's-Head?* He himſelf is willing to contract the Number to no more than [r] Matthew Parker *and his Collegues whom the Queen had named as ſoon almoſt as ſhe was upon the Throne*, to Parker [s] *and three or four others of Queen* Elizabeth's *firſt Promotion*; to *Parker*, [t] *Grindal*, *Horne*, *Jewell* and *Sands*. Wherein he runs counter to the principal of the *Nag's-Head* Hiſtorians, *Anthony Champney*, who makes no fewer than fifteen of our Biſhops nominated by the Queen *An.* 1559. and conſecrated at the Tavern by *Scory*; but *Le Quien* cuts off two third parts of that Number, and puts off their Conſecration to a longer Day, till *Ann.* 1562. after the Meeting of the Convocation in that Year. *Le Quien*'s Hypotheſis is, That *the Biſhops* of that Convocation *reviſed and corrected* King *Edward*'s Ordinal, and made *a Rule* for the future Biſhops and Clergy to be ordained by that Form; and that from that time they began to be ordained by that Form, tho' none of them before had any Ordination at all. Reviſe the Ordinal they might, in order to declare, as they do *Art.* 36. that *it contains all things neceſſary to the Conſecration and Ordering of Arch-Biſhops, Biſhops, Prieſts, and Deacons; neither hath it any thing that is of itſelf ſuperſtitious and ungodly:* But for correcting it, there *Le Quien* ſhould have been better informed, there not being a Word altered in it, but the ſame Form tranſmitted down, and continued for a whole Century without Alteration, till the Year 1662. when the Alteration was made, Receive the Holy Ghoſt *for the Office and Work*

[r] T. 1. p. 318. [s] T. 1. p. 425. [t] P. 426.

of

of a Biſhop, &c. and for *the Office and Work of a Prieſt*, &c. in the reſpective Ordinations of Biſhops and Prieſts. But from whence had *Le Quien* his Information that the Synod of 1562. made a [v] *Rule* that the Biſhops for the future ſhould be conſecrated by the Ordinal of King *Edward?* and that the Conſecration of them by that Form in Queen *Elizabeth*'s Reign began not before that time? He has it not from our Hiſtory, but if he have any Ground for it, it muſt be only from the Articles. In the thirty ſixth Article, after the Words already ſet down, it follows, *And therefore whoſoever are conſecrated or ordered according to the Rites of that Book, ſince the ſecond Year of King* Edward *unto this time, or hereafter ſhall be conſecrated or ordered according to the ſame Rites, we decree all ſuch to be rightly, orderly, and lawfully conſecrated and ordered.* Does the Convocation decree in theſe Words, that the Biſhops and Clergy ſhall hereafter be conſecrated and ordained by the Form in King *Edward*'s Book? Suppoſe (as the Matter of Fact was) the Form had been re-eſtabliſhed in Parliament 1 *Eliz.* and it had been, and was by Law to be the conſtant Practice from that time to make uſe of it in all Ordinations; might not the convocation notwithſtanding have made the ſame authoritative Declaration, that *all that are conſecrated or ordained* by that Form *from King* Edward's *Reign to that time*, (meaning ſo many of themſelves, no queſtion, otherwiſe the very Article is a Sentence of Condemnation againſt themſelves) or *ſhould hereafter be conſecrated or ordained by it, they decree all ſuch to be rightly and lawfully ordained?* Might they not ſay all this, and yet have no Thought of making a *Rule*, but referring to one made already, how the Clergy were to be ordained? But it would

[v] T. 1. Addit. p. ii.

have

have ſaved the *Father* the Trouble of this Invention, if he had known, that at the ſame time when the Convocation were paſſing theſe Articles, the Eſtates of the Realm were ſitting in Parliament, and their Seſſion and the Meeting of the Convocation began the ſame Day. If it had been Queen *Elizabeth*'s Mind (as *Le Quien* pretends the Convocation acted by her Order) that King *Edward*'s Form, having never been uſed before, ſhould be put in Practice for the future, would either ſhe, or the Biſhops, who *Le Quien* ſays were ordered to make a Rule for the Uſe of it, have thought that to be ſufficient, without the paſſing of an Act of Parliament in that Seſſion, to give the Form a legal Eſtabliſhment, and oblige the Biſhops to make uſe of that Form and no other in their Ordinations? Muſt they not have ſeen that without ſuch a Statute made by the Queen and the Eſtates of the Realm, the Ordinations could have no Effect in point of Law, whatever Eccleſiaſtical Authority they might have from any Act of the Clergy in Convocation? the Biſhops conſecrated would have been no Biſhops in Law, the Prieſts and Deacons no legal Prieſts and Deacons, tho' ordained by a Form of the Convocation's Appointment. If *Le Quien* had known that there was a Parliament then ſitting, and that without their Concurrence that which he ſays was done by the Convocation would have been to ſo little Purpoſe; it would have diſcouraged him from relating this Piece of Hiſtory without the leaſt Ground for it but his own Imagination.

The Author, by Le Quien's *Account, guilty of another Self-Contradiction.*

7. We have ſeen how far the *Father* comes ſhort of ſatisfying us, that his making *Stapleton* deny that our firſt Biſhops were conſecrated by King *Edward*'s Form, is not to make him contradict himſelf, and ſay, of the very ſame Perſons, firſt, in

in his Preface to the *Counterblaſt*, that they *were* conſecrated by that Form; and preſently after, in the firſt Chapter of his *Work*, that they *were not* conſecrated by that Form. We have ſeen of how little Service to him his Evaſion is, by a Diſtinction of two Sets of Queen *Elizabeth*'s Biſhops, which is both inconſiſtent with the Words and Deſign of the Author in his Preface, and with the Truth of our Hiſtory and Conſtitution. But it was ſhewed before, that it makes him guilty of another Self-Contradiction, in ſaying at firſt, that King *Edward*'s Statute for his Form of conſecrating Biſhops, *&c.* was *not revived* by Queen *Elizabeth*, but left under Queen *Mary*'s Repeal; and yet ſaying preſently afterwards (as *Le Quien* interprets his Words) that the ſame Statute *was revived* by her, and reſtored to its former Authority; ſo that our Biſhops, for want of being ordained by the Form preſcribed by it, were ordained *contrary to the Preſcript of the very Statutes.* How the *Father* would have ſhewed his Skill in attempting to ſalve this Difficulty, and clear his Author from Self-Contradiction, it cannot appear, becauſe he was not aware of it. But, conſidering his Forwardneſs, in ſo many Inſtances, to ſay at random what he pleaſes of our Hiſtory and Conſtitution, it would not be ſtrange for him to ſay, That the Author ſpeaks of *different Times*, when he ſays that Statute was *not revived*, and when he ſays it *was revived*; That he means it was *not revived* by Queen *Elizabeth* in her firſt Parliament, *Ann.* 1559. but it *was revived* at the Diſtance of ſome Years after, *Ann.* 1562. when the Convocation made a *Rule* for King *Edward*'s Form to be made uſe of in all the following Ordinations, and ſo King *Edward*'s Statute was revived by a Convocation inſtead of a Parliament, tho' there was a Parliament then ſitting. It muſt be a great Miſtake in point of Law to ſuppoſe that a Convocation

vocation has ſuch a Power, of making or reviving Acts of Parliament; but ſuch a Miſtake may be excuſed, among many others, in a *Writer* that takes upon him to know our Conſtitution, and the Hiſtory of our Parliaments and Convocations, better than we do ourſelves. 'Tis unhappy for him that ſo great a Number of Biſhops as muſt be ſuppoſed by his Account to have been conſecrated between the Years 1562. and 1567. all that were put into the vacant Sees, except *Parker* and three or four more of the *firſt Promotion*, muſt according to our Account be reduced to no more than one[w], *Robinſon* of *Bangor*, or two at the moſt, if *Jones*, that ſucceeded *Kitchin* in the See of *Landaff*, were conſecrated before the End of the Year 1566.

A third Self-Contradiction that he muſt be guilty of.

The Interpretation which *Le Quien* gives us of *Stapleton*'s Words (*the very Statutes*) may yet appear to be more fruitful in Self-Contradictions than has been repreſented. The Author had ſaid expreſly that King *Henry*'s Statute was revived in Queen *Elizabeth*'s firſt Year, and no other (relating to the Conſecration of Biſhops) but that Statute; King *Edward*'s (as he expreſly ſays) being not revived. If what he ſays afterwards implies that King *Edward*'s Statute was revived, how could the Revival of both theſe Statutes (whereof the one preſcribed that no Form but the *Roman Pontifical*, the other that none but the *New Ordinal* ſhould be made uſe of) ſtand together? Could they be both revived in that wherein they were both contradictory to one another? King *Henry*'s Statute might be revived by Queen *Elizabeth* (as indeed it was) in all the other Parts of it, the King's Nomination of the Biſhops, their Election by the Chapters, and their being confirmed and conſecrated, without any Bull from the Pope, by

[w] Sup. p. 182.

the

the Arch-Biſhop or Biſhops: But if the Queen revived King *Edward*'s Statute, it muſt, as it did at firſt, ſet aſide the Uſe of the Pontifical, and annul that Part of King *Henry*'s Statute that required it to be uſed, or elſe both muſt be in force, and the Subjects muſt be under two contradictory Obligations, according to the Preſcript of theſe Statutes. The Author is more conſiſtent with himſelf than *Le Quien* makes him: He makes the Conſecration of our Biſhops illegal (by our own Statutes) becauſe they were not conſecrated by the *Roman* Pontifical, according to King *Henry*'s Statute then revived. Accordingly, he perſiſts in the ſame Declaration afterwards in the *Counterblaſt*, *lib. 3. chap.* 19. where he tells *Horne*[x], "Hic vides—— quod vera conſecratio neceſſaria "ſit, quam Tu & Confratres tui nunquam ha- "buiſtis. Et propterea verè dici poteſt, Vos ne- "que *jure Eccleſiæ* neque *Patriæ Legibus* eſſe E- "piſcopos, præſertim cum conſecratio *decreto* "*Parliamenti* expreſſè requiratur; quod idem in "Suffraganeis regnante jam *Elizabethâ* renovatur, "ideoque, multò magis in vobis requiritur qui "Epiſcoporum nomen & dignitatem vobis aſ- "ſumitis." Here he can mean no other *Decree* or Act *of Parliament* but the Statute 25 *H.* VIII. nor any Conſecration but by the Form in the *Roman* Pontifical; and for want of this he ſays *Horne* and his *Brethren never had any true Conſecration*, and conſequently *were No Biſhops, either by the Laws of the Church or of the Realm*; that is, as he expreſſes himſelf in the firſt Chapter, neither by *the Preſcript of the Church, nor of the very Statutes.*

The Author's Confeſſion in the Counter-blaſt, *that*

8. I may therefore look upon it as ſufficiently proved, That the Ground of *Stapleton*'s Objection

[x] Op. T. 2. p. 1031.

againſt

againſt the Legality of the Conſecration of our Biſhops was their being all of them, and *Horne* eſpecially, conſecrated by the Form in King *Edward*'s Ordinal; and conſequently, that we have his plain Confeſſion that they were conſecrated by that Form. And this Confeſſion utterly deſtroys any Pretence of our Adverſaries to make him ſay, in Contradiction to himſelf, in any other Place of his Works, that they were *not conſecrated* by that Form. He owns they were conſecrated by it, within ſo little time after their Conſecration as in the Year 1567. when he writ his *Counterblaſt*; and if there were any Ground from his Words twenty or thirty Years after, to think that he then denies what he had affirmed ſo long before, and ſo near the time of the Fact, it muſt be imputed to his want of Memory or any other Cauſe, rather than that he ſpeaks of his own Knowledge or Perſuaſion. But there is no Ground to ſuppoſe there is any ſuch Difference between what he ſays in the firſt and the latter Parts of his Works; the worſt that he is pretended to ſay, *That our Biſhops came at firſt into their Sees only by the Royal Authority*, being no more than what he had told *Horne* in the *Counterblaſt*, That *he was called to his Function only by the Letters Patents of the Prince:* And if this was then conſiſtent with his ſaying that *Horne* was conſecrated by the Form in King *Edward*'s Ordinal, he cannot be pretended to deny it afterwards in an Expreſſion which plainly appears to have the ſame Meaning.

our Biſhops were conſecrated by King Edward's *Form, ſhews there can be no Ground to pretend from other Places of his Works that he denies they were ſo conſecrated.*

The ſame Confeſſion is, as far as *Stapleton*'s Authority goes, a Proof that what *Harding* or any other Writers of that time are alledged for, as if they denied that our Biſhops were conſecrated by that Form, muſt either not have that Meaning, or that what they ſay muſt be falſe, as contrary to *Stapleton*'s expreſs Declaration. And this might be a ſufficient Anſwer to what the *Remarker*

It ſhews, from his Authority, that the other Writers *muſt either have the ſame meaning, or that what they*

ſay muſt be falſe.

marker [x] alledges, from the *Anſwer* to my *Lord* Burghley's *Treatiſe of the* Engliſh *Juſtice*, to prove that when their Authors ſay *our Biſhops were not conſecrated according to their own Statutes, they particularly mean that even their own* Ordinal *was not uſed.* It were enough to leave it to him to reconcile that Writer, who he pretends *denies* that our Ordinal was uſed, to *Stapleton* who expreſly *affirms* that it was uſed. But the very Words of the Writer that he cites will fully ſatisfy him that he very much miſtakes his Meaning: The Words are, "They know, and it has been proved *in* "*open Court*, that they not only uſurp thoſe "Places (of Biſhops) againſt God's and the "Church's Laws, but that they even were not "made and inveſted according to the *new Laws* "of the *Realm*, *ſpecially* made for the Conſecra-"tion of them." In the *Latin* of the *Reſponſio ad Perſecutores* Anglos, *done*, as he ſays, *by the ſame Author*, and printed in the *Concertatio Eccleſiæ Catholicæ*, *&c.* the Words are, "[y] Ipſi non ig-"norant, & in *publico juriſdicundi foro* clariſſimè "fuit demonſtratum, eos non modo contra ve-"teres leges Dei & Eccleſiæ, ſed etiam contra "*nova ab* ipſis *fabricata Statuta*, & de illis creandis "& initiandis *propriè* lata, ſedes eas conſcendiſſe." Here the firſt Part of what is ſaid (in the *Latin* and *Engliſh*) clears the Meaning of the Whole.

The Remarker's *Allegation from the Anſwer to the Treatiſe of* Engliſh *Juſtice, confutes itſelf.*

The Court of Juſtice wherein it is pretended this was proved, could be no other than the Court of *King's Bench*, at that time, wherein *Bonner*'s Plea againſt *Horne* was received, and the Judges agreed that it ſhould be tried by the proper Jury. If that Plea had ever come to a Trial in that Court, in Proof of it, it would have been offered to be argued by *Bonner*'s Counſel, [z] That *Horne* was conſecrated by King *Edward*'s Form not yet re-eſta-

[x] P. 299. [y] Concertatio, &c. fol. 313. b. [z] Sup. p. 193.

bliſhed by Parliament, and conſequently was no legal Biſhop. There was no Proof of the Plea offered by the Counſel, much leſs *openly* made *in Court*, becauſe the Cauſe never came to a Trial before the Judges and a Jury, which never was impannelled to try it: But if it had, how well would it have been to the *Remarker*'s Purpoſe? The thing that muſt be ſuppoſed to be proved *in Court*, is, That *Horne* was conſecrated by King *Edward*'s Form, but to no effect, becauſe that Form was not legally authorized. Would this have been a Proof, that the Ordinal was *not uſed* in *Horne*'s Conſecration, or that it was *really uſed?* If it muſt have been a Proof of the latter, we ſee how the *Remarker*'s Allegation from that Writer confutes itſelf; I mean, proves that the Ordinal was *not uſed*, becauſe it was *in fact really uſed.*

What Stapleton *ſays of the Caſe between* Bonner *and* Horne *conſiſtent with his owning that our Biſhops were conſecrated by King* Edward's *Form.*

'Tis true the Writer of the Anſwer to *Engliſh Juſtice* has the Confidence to repreſent the Proceedings in the Caſe between *Bonner* and *Horne*, as very much to the Advantage of the Cauſe of the Popiſh Party, and to the Diſcredit of the Proteſtant Biſhops lately made. And in this *Stapleton*, it appears, joins with him, by what he ſays, firſt in his *Fortreſs of Faith*, and afterwards in his *Counterblaſt* to *Horne*. The former was writ, *Ann.* 1565. ſome time after *Bonner*'s Plea, That *Horne* was No Biſhop, was entered in the Court of *King's-Bench*, and the Judges had come to an Agreement, that it ſhould be tried by a Jury. The Information *Stapleton* had of this from *England* encouraged him to expreſs himſelf thus in the *Fortreſs* [a] (after thoſe Words, "I ſay by "the Verdict of Holy Scripture and Practice of "the Primitive Church theſe Men are *No Biſhops*) "I ſpeak nothing of the *Laws of the Realm*, it "hath been of late ſufficiently proved, that "they are no Biſhops, if they ſhould be *tryed*

[a] Fortreſs of Faith, p. 368. ſup. p. 259.

" *thereby.*" He had heard, it appears, of *Bonner*'s Plea being received upon Iſſue, and ordered to be tried, and the young Divine's warm Head was much elated upon the News, and full of Aſſurance that *Bonner* could not fail of the Victory, now there was a Way opened for him to look his Adverſary in the Face in the Field of Battel. And this makes him ſo forward as to ſay, *it had been of late ſufficiently proved they were no Biſhops*; not that there had been a Trial already wherein it was proved by *Bonner*'s Counſel (who never had Occaſion to prove it, becauſe it never came to a Trial) but that his Warmth made him ſo confident that it would be proved, that he looked upon it as proved already. So the *Tranſlator* underſtands him, and renders the Words [b], " Satis nu-" per *de facto probatum* fuit eos juxta Leges Epiſ-" copos non eſſe." And *Le Quien* [c] expreſſes it that it was *verified*; an Expreſſion that might make one believe that there had been plain Proof made in Court, and entered there upon Record. But if there had been any thing proved, what muſt it be? According to what *Stapleton* underſtood of the Matter, it muſt have been, That *Horne* and his Brethren were conſecrated by the Form in King *Edward*'s Ordinal, and therefore were no Biſhops, becauſe that Form was not yet *revived* by Act of Parliament. This muſt have been the Proof, if *Stapleton* had been of *Bonner*'s Counſel; and could ſuch a Proof have been of any Service to *Le Quien*, to ſhew that *Horne*, *&c.* were not conſecrated by King *Edward*'s Form?

But the Author ſpeaks in much higher Terms in the *Counterblaſt* [d], ſuch as, in *Le Quien*'s Judgment, cannot be underſtood of any thing leſs than the Ordination at the Tavern. He had ſaid that after the Act paſſed, 5 *Eliz.* empowering the Biſhops to tender the Oath of Supremacy to all

[b] Op. T. 2. p. 796. [c] T. 1. p. 271. [d] C. 5. p. 33, 34.

Eccleſiaſtical Perſons, on pain of incurring a *Præmunire* if they refuſed, the Catholicks all expected to have it tendered to them, as ſoon as that Parliament was riſen. The Occaſion of its not being tendered might perhaps, he ſays, be the *Plague* that then broke out, or the *Queen's ſpecial Order, Goodneſs, and Mercy.* "But no "Thanks to You, Sir, (he ſays to *Horne*) who "ſo ſore thirſted and longed for the *Catholicks* "*Blood*; and therefore as ſoon as God's Plague "ceaſed, thought to have yourſelf *plagued* the "Catholicks, exacting the Oath of Mr. Dr. *Bon-*"*ner* Biſhop of *London.* But lo here now began "your and your Fellows the Proteſtant Biſhops "*wonderful Plague and Scourge,* That thro' your "own ſeeking and calling this Man to the Oath, "the Matter ſo marvellouſly fell out, that you "and your Fellows, as ye were no *Church-Biſhops,* "whoſe Authority ye had forſaken and defied, ſo "ye were alſo no *Parliament Biſhops.* Upon the "which (a pitiful Caſe!) your State, your Ho-"nour, your Worſhip, and Biſhoply Authority, "your Faith and all, now reſteth and dependeth. "A marvellous Providence of God, that while "ye could not be content to ſpoil the true Biſhops "of their worldly Eſtate and Honour, but muſt "needs have their *poor Life* and all, ye yourſelves "were *found to be no Biſhops,* no not by the *very* "*Statutes* of the Realm."

He ſays this two Years after he had declared in his former Works, that if *Bonner*'s Caſe came to be tried, the Day would certainly be their own. And accordingly here, as if the Matter were decided for *Bonner*, againſt *Horne*, we have a loud Proclamation of a ſurprizing Victory gained on their Side, and a total Defeat of *Horne* and his Brethren; of *a wonderful* Plague *and* Scourge *that he and his Fellows had by the marvellous* Providence *of God, brought upon themſelves, by calling* Bonner

to the Oath. What, at firſt Sight, could we imagine to be the Meaning of this great Turn of *Providence*, but that it had brought to light a plain Diſcovery, that *Horne*, *Parker*, and the reſt of our firſt Biſhops had no other but that ſcandalous Ordination at the *Tavern* in *Cheapſide?* Don't we ſee that if the Author were in his Senſes, that Story muſt have forced itſelf upon him, and obliged him to make an open Publication of it? Yet the whole of this *wonderful Plague and Scourge* comes to no more, than that they were *no Parliament Biſhops*; that *they were found to be no Biſhops by the very Statutes of the Realm.* This *pitiful Caſe* (as he calls it) they would have been in, if it had been determined, that, being ordained by King *Edward*'s Form not yet authorized, they could be no Biſhops in Law; for except Queen *Elizabeth*'s firſt Parliament had re-eſtabliſhed that Form, they were illegally ordained, and ſo could not be *Parliament Biſhops*, nor *Biſhops by the Statutes of the Realm.* And if *Stapleton*'s Words do not neceſſarily imply that he means any thing more than this, by their ſad and *pitiful* Condition; then it cannot, with any Logick, be inferr'd, that he muſt mean any thing more: But if, beſides, it plainly appears, that he affirms elſewhere in expreſs Terms, that the Biſhops were illegally ordained becauſe they were conſecrated by King *Edward*'s Ordinal *not yet revived*, then it is impoſſible that he could mean any thing elſe in this Paſſage. 'Tis true, that the Matter never came to a Trial in the Courts below, but ſlept till the Parliament took it in hand, and decided the Caſe by the Statute 8 *Eliz.* The Biſhops therefore muſt have had their *Plague and Scourge* from that Parliament; *Bonner* muſt (in *Stapleton*'s Opinion) be acquitted there, and *Horne and his Fellows* caſt, that is, declared to be *No Biſhops.* Yet granting that to be his Opinion (contrary to the Matter

of

of Fact) ſtill he might, nay muſt, mean nothing more, than that the Caſe was ſo reſolved by the Lords and Commons in Parliament, that King *Edward*'s Ordinal had not been re-eſtabliſhed by Act of Parliament before *Horne* and *Parker*, *&c.* were conſecrated, and conſequently they were by Law no Biſhops till this Parliament 8 *Eliz.* ſhould reſtore the Ordinal and confirm them. That the Caſe was not ſo reſolved in Parliament, but reſolved on the contrary, that King *Edward*'s Ordinal was re-eſtabliſhed 1 *Eliz.*, is plain from the Words of the Statute 8 *Eliz.*; and the Statute ſhews, that all that the Parliament did in favour of *Bonner*, was to indemnify him for his former Refuſal of the Oath, which Eſcape and Deliverance, from a Sentence which in ſtrict Juſtice might have paſſed upon him, *Stapleton*'s Heat, over-running his Judgment, made him proclaim in this Paſſage to be a Victory on *Bonner*'s Side.

9. Here it may be proper, once for all, to obſerve how much the Tranſlation of *Stapleton* is more ſerviceable to *Le Quien*'s Purpoſe, than it would have been for him to have cited the Author's own Words in the Original. I need do no more than lay before the Reader the Words in *Latin* that the Tranſlator gives us, which ought faithfully and exactly to anſwer the *Engliſh* in this Paſſage. The *Engliſh* I have juſt before ſet down: The *Latin* is, "[e] Nihil tibi hâc in re gratiarum "deberi certò ſcimus, qui uſque adeo *ſanguinem* "*Catholicorum* ſitiebas, ut quamprimùm peſtis "illa cœperat miteſcere, ipſe continuò ſævire in "illos & peſtem animi teterrimam immittere co"gitabas. Et primo impetu *Bonnerum* Epiſco"pum adortus juramentum hoc illi obtuliſti. De"ſævire cœpit malitia tua, *Horne*, & tuorum,

[e] Replica ad Horni Flatum, c. 5. Op. T. 2. p. 856.

" ſed ita (diſponente Deo) in caput tuum & Fra-
" trum Pſeudo-epiſcoporum peſtis converſa eſt.
" Nam dum eum exagitarent, & ad ſuſcipiendum
" juramentum omnibus modis importunè urge-
" rent, ipſi EPISCOPI LARVATI DEPREHENSI
" SUNT. Eccleſiæ enim filii & veri Epiſcopi
" eſſe non potuerunt, quandoquidem Eccleſiæ
" Dei nuntium remiſerunt: Nec Epiſcopi Par-
" liamentarii reperiri potuerunt, nam *Statuta Reg-*
" *ni nihil de iis adhuc Statuerant.* Mirabilis Deus
" in filiis hominum. Dum lupi rapaces non con-
" tenti veros & legitimos Paſtores authoritate,
" opibus, honore ſpoliâſſe, vitæ etiam & animis
" inſidiarentur, ipſi ſubſidio Parliamenti & omni
" juris colore deſtituti, ut *Simiæ ſine veſte uni-*
" *verſo mundo ridendi* exhibentur." It is to this Paſſage in the *Latin* (as home and deciſive to prove his Point) that *Le Quien* gives the firſt Place of all the Teſtimonies which he alledges from *Stapleton*; he ſets down moſt of it [f], and takes care to give his Readers Warning not to paſs by unobſerved, the Expreſſion *Epiſcopi Larvati deprehenſi ſunt*, by putting thoſe Words in great Letters: And his Paraphraſe upon them, and the Words juſt before is, [g] that Stapleton *informs us there That the Proteſtant Biſhops, and* Parker *at the Head of them, joined with* Horne *againſt* Bonner, *that they were Parties together with* Horne *in the Proceſs againſt* Bonner, *that they came off with Diſgrace, that* Bonner *proved before the Judges, and in the Face of all the World, that they had only the* Maſques *of Biſhops, and that he pulled off their* Maſques; that is, diſcovered them to be Counterfeits and Impoſtors.

If *Bonner* made Proof of this *before the Judges*, then it appears there was a Trial; but *Le Quien* is to be deſired to inform us of the Time and Place when and where this Trial was, *before the*

[f] T. 1. p. 260, 261, 262. [g] P. 261.

Judges,

Judges, and the Jury too, who muſt be there to try the Fact; but we don't find, that there ever was a Jury ſummoned, or that the Judges went farther than to reſolve *that if the Matter were ſo, it ſhould be tried by a Jury.* Except we take *Le Quien*'s Meaning to be, that *Bonner* proved them to be Counterfeit-Biſhops *before the Judges, and in the Face of the World*, at the Bar of the Houſe of Lords in Parliament; but then the *Father* is to ſhew us that *Bonner* or his Counſel were either ſummoned, or had Leave upon their Petition, to appear at the Bar of the Lords for that purpoſe. But the worſt of it is, that *Stapleton*, who, *Le Quien* tells us, is our *Informer*, ſays not a Word of our *Biſhops in Maſques*, and *Bonner*'s *unmasking them*, as appears from the original *Engliſh*; but the Expreſſion, *Epiſcopi Larvati deprehenſi ſunt*, has nothing in the *Engliſh* to anſwer it, but is an Addition in the *Latin* of the Tranſlator, or Tranſlators, (for two, it appears, had the *Counterblaſt* in hand) from their own Invention; tho' the *Father* lays the greateſt Streſs upon thoſe Words, and no queſtion thought they would bid fair to convince his Readers, that *Stapleton* ſays our Biſhops had no better Ordination than the *Mock-Conſecration* at the *Nag's-Head.* The Tranſlators take the Liberty of making further Additions to the Author; the firſt is after the Words, in the *Engliſh*, *No Parliament Biſhops*, in the *Latin*, *Nec Epiſcopi Parliamentarii reperiri potuerunt*; where they offer a Reaſon of their own, *Nam Statuta Regni nihil de iis adhuc Statuerant*; and to make room for this Addition, they leave out the following Clauſe, *Upon which (a pitiful Caſe) your State, &c.* *Le Quien* tranſcribes the Addition, but might have ſeen how groundleſs it is; for if ever the Parliament determined any thing of our Biſhops, if ever they made them Parliamentary, it was *Ann.* 1566. the Year before *Stapleton* writ againſt

Horne; ſo that he could not have ſaid, with any Truth, that the Statutes had as yet determined nothing about them. The other is in the laſt Clauſe of the *Latin*, where for *Ye* in the Beginning, the Verſion has it *Lupi iſti rapaces*; and in the End, for *Were found to be no Biſhops, no not by the very Statutes of the Realm*, the *Latin* is, *Ipſi ſubſidio Parliamenti & omni juris colore deſtituti, ut Simiæ ſine veſte univerſo mundo ridendi exhibentur.* "They having no Support from the Parliament, "nor Pretence of Law, as *Monkeys in Purple*, "were diſrobed, and expoſed to be laugh'd at by "the whole World." The Tranſlators may ſeem to allude to that Story in *Lucian*, of the Apes in *Egypt* that were taught to dance in Purple and Viſors, but a waggiſh Spectator throwing down ſome Nuts before them, the Purple and Maſks ſoon fell off, and the Monkeys appeared. This they might take to be an Improvement of their Author in the Tranſlation, and no Injury: But what can we ſay for *Le Quien*'s producing *Stapleton* under the *Mask* (I may ſay) of their Additions, as if he laid the Author before us in his own Words? If he had ſeen the Author's *Counterblaſt* in *Engliſh* it will admit of no Excuſe; and but very little if he had not. The Edition of all his Works in *Latin* we muſt believe that the *Father* had before him; there he might have learnt from the ſhort Preface of the Publiſhers, *Tome* I. that the *Fortreſs*, *Counterblaſt*, *&c.* were writ in *Engliſh* only by the Author, and put into *Latin* for that Edition twenty Years after his Deceaſe, by *Engliſh* Divines employed by the Editors. And this he might have ſeen again in the ſecond *Tome*, in the very Title Pages [h] of the *Propugnaculum Fidei*, *Replica ad* Horni *Flatum*, *&c.* where the ſame Account is given, with the Name, or the initial

[h] T. 2. p. 719, 817, 1107.

Letters

Judges, and the Jury too, who muſt be there to try the Fact; but we don't find, that there ever was a Jury ſummoned, or that the Judges went farther than to reſolve *that if the Matter were ſo, it ſhould be tried by a Jury.* Except we take *Le Quien*'s Meaning to be, that *Bonner* proved them to be Counterfeit-Biſhops *before the Judges, and in the Face of the World*, at the Bar of the Houſe of Lords in Parliament; but then the *Father* is to ſhew us that *Bonner* or his Counſel were either ſummoned, or had Leave upon their Petition, to appear at the Bar of the Lords for that purpoſe. But the worſt of it is, that the Author *Stapleton* ſays not a Word of our *Biſhops in Maſques*, and *Bonner*'s *unmaſking them*; but the Expreſſion, *Epiſcopi Larvati deprehenſi ſunt*, which *Le Quien* looks upon to be of ſo great Importance, has nothing in the *Original Engliſh* to anſwer it, but is an Addition of the Tranſlators, in the *Latin*, from their own Invention.

They take the Liberty of making farther Additions to the Author's Text; the firſt is after the Words *Nec Epiſcopi Parliamentarii reperiri potuerunt*; where they offer a Reaſon of their own, *Nam Statuta Regni nihil de iisad huc ſtatuerant. They could not be Parliament-Biſhops, becauſe the Statutes of the Realm had not yet ordained any thing concerning them.* *Le Quien*[f] makes the Words a Proof of the Author's denying that Horne *and his Brethren were conſecrated by King* Edward's *Form, becauſe if they were*, Stapleton *could not declare them to be no Biſhops according to the Manner approved of by Parliament*, Q. Elizabeth's *firſt Parliament being ſuppoſed to have re-eſtabliſhed that Form.* But here the *Father* impoſes upon us, as if *Stapleton ſuppoſed* this to have been done by that Parliament, whereas he expreſly declares the contrary, [g] That the Statute for K. *Edward*'s Form was not *revived* in that Parliament, but that our Biſhops, notwithſtanding, were ordained by that Form, and therefore their Ordination was illegal.

[f] T. 1. p. 262.

[g] Sup. p. 300, 301.

The Tranſlators therefore, and the Author himſelf (ſuppoſing the Words had been his) muſt mean by the *Statutes of the Realm not having yet ordained any thing concerning them*, nothing elſe but that no Statute had yet been made to approve of their being ordained by K. *Edward*'s Form, and therefore they were not ordained *in the manner approved of by Parliament*, nor could be looked upon to be *Parliament-Biſhops*.

The other is in the laſt Clauſe of the *Latin*, where in the End, for *Were found to be no Biſhops, no not by the very Statutes of the Realm*, the *Latin* is, *Ipſi ſubſidio Parliamenti & omni juris colore deſtituti, ut Simiæ ſine veſte univerſo mundo ridendi exhibentur.* "They "having no Support from the Parliament, nor "Pretence of Law, as *Monkeys in Purple*, were diſ-"robed, and expoſed to be laugh'd at by the whole "World." The Tranſlators may allude to *Lucian*'s Story of the Apes in *Egypt* that were taught to dance in Purple and Viſors, but a waggiſh Spectator throwing down ſome Nuts before them, the Purple and Maſks ſoon fell off, and the Monkeys appeared. This they might take to be an Improvement of their Author, and no Injury: But what can we ſay for *Le Quien*'s producing *Stapleton* under the *Mask* (I may ſay) of their Additions, as if he laid the Author before us in his own Words? If he had ſeen the Author's *Counterblaſt* in *Engliſh*, it will admit of no Excuſe; and but very little, if he had not. The Edition of all his Works in *Latin* we muſt believe that the *Father* had before him; there he might have learnt from the ſhort Preface of the Publiſhers, *Tome* I. that the *Fortreſs*, *Counterblaſt*, *&c.* were writ in *Engliſh* only by the Author, and put into *Latin* for that Edition twenty Years after his Deceaſe, by *Engliſh* Divines employed by the Editors. And this he might have ſeen again in the ſecond *Tome*, in the very Title Pages[h] of the *Propugnaculum Fidei*, *Replica ad* Horni *Flatum*, *&c.* where the ſame Account is given, with the Name, or the initial Letters

[h] T. 2. p. 719, 817, 1107.

Letters of the Names, of the *Tranſlators*; which could not well eſcape the Obſervation of any one that turned to thoſe particular Books in that *Tome*. With ſo little Trouble might the *Father* have prevented his own falling into a ridiculous Miſtake, as well as impoſing upon his Readers the unwarrantable *Interpolation* of a *Tranſlator*, with his own *Comment* upon it, for the Author's genuine *Text* and Meaning; eſpecially, if he had conſidered, that at the time of the *Paris* Edition, (*Ann.* 1620.) *Champney*'s Account of the *Nag's-Head* Ordination, printed at the ſame Place, had been made publick for ſome Years, and the Tranſlators might well be ſuſpected to be prepared by that Story, to make their Author appear to favour it, and to give that Turn to any thing they met with in his *Engliſh* Works, whether they had good Grounds or not from his own Words; as appears from their Additions or Omiſſions in ſeveral Places cited before.

Summary of what is ſaid in this and the former Chapter, relating to his Teſtimony.

To give the Reader a ſhort Summary of what has been ſaid relating to *Stapleton:* That he knew nothing of the Ordination at the *Nag's-Head*, is proved ‘ from *Bonner*'s [i] being unacquainted with it; ‘ from his own Readineſs to lay hold upon all Opportunities [k] to blacken the Characters of the firſt Reformers, eſpecially the *Engliſh* Biſhops and Clergy, without any Warrant from the Truth and Certainty of the ſcandalous Stories which he tells of them; but never opening his Mouth notwithſtanding, to vent this Piece of Scandal, at ſo many times, when the Subject he was writing upon, as well as his own Temper and Inclination, muſt unavoidably have led him to proclaim his Knowledge of this Fact, if it had been known to him, to the Chriſtian World; ‘ from his telling us [l]

[i] Sup. p. 233, 334. [k] Sup. p. 239. ad p. 246. p. 255. ad p. 258. [l] Sup. p. 249. ad p. 253.

when he firſt took upon him to write, and perſiſting in it almoſt thirty Years after, that all the Popiſh Biſhops, all the True Biſhops, to a Man, were deprived of their Biſhopricks by Queen *Elizabeth*; which no Body could ſay that knew that *Kitchin* of *Landaff* kept his Biſhoprick, and had like to have been the principal Actor in the *Nag's-Head* Ordination; 'from his expreſly affirming [m] that our Biſhops were conſecrated by the Form in King *Edward*'s Ordinal, a Teſtimony which makes it impoſſible for his Words in any other Place to be interpreted in a Senſe contradictory to it, in attempting which F. *Le Quien* does only make himſelf ridiculous; and laſtly, 'from its being evident, that all the Paſſages alledged by *Le Quien*, as if they proved, that he ſays our Biſhops were not ordained by *any* Impoſition of Hands *at all*, (and conſequently not by King *Edward*'s Ordinal, by which the *Lambeth* Regiſter relates that they were ordained) amount to nothing more than that he ſays they had not [n] the Impoſition of *true Biſhops Hands*, which the *Father*, by a poor Fallacy, makes to be the ſame with their having no Impoſition of Hands *at all*. 'Tis unhappy that he ſhould think it becomes him to play the *Sophiſter* in this manner, and to uſe this Trick to impoſe upon his Readers; but he had no other Way to compaſs his Deſign of making the Author an Evidence for him, to diſprove the Account of the Ordination of our firſt Biſhops at *Lambeth*, and to countenance another Story of their being ordain'd in a ſcandalous Place, and in a profane ſacrilegious Manner. If he had alledged his Author, as ſaying no more than that our Biſhops had not the laying on of Hands of true Biſhops; this would belong only to the Queſtion Whether they had a valid Ordination from the

[m] Sup. p. 301. [n] Sup. p. 262. ad p. 270.

Hands

Hands of the proper Miniſters? But *Le Quien* is poſitive that [o] this was not (as he ſays F. *Courayer*, *Bramhall*, *&c.* would have it) the Queſtion between their Controvertiſts and ours, at that time, about the Ordination of our firſt Biſhops; that the *Diſpute was not about* (the Point of Right) *the Validity or Invalidity of the Orders which they had received, but* (the Point of Fact) *their having been ordained at all, in any Manner whatſoever.* His Witneſſes that they had no manner of Ordination at all, are Biſhop *Bonner*, *Stapleton*, *Harding*, *&c.* *Stapleton*'s Teſtimony he makes to be, That the Biſhops were made *without Solemnity, without any Eccleſiaſtical Ceremony, without any Impoſition of Hands*, the Ceremony required by King *Edward*'s Ordinal, and conſequently had no manner of Ordination at all; and the *Lambeth Regiſter*, which ſays they were ordained by the Ceremonial of King *Edward* VI. is utterly falſe. If nothing of his Allegations from *Stapleton* comes up to this Point of *Fact*, but only to the other of *Right*; That they had not Impoſition of Hands from the proper Miniſters, that is, true Biſhops; and the Author might affirm this agreeably to his Principles, and yet not deny but that in Fact they had Hands really laid upon them, according to King *Edward*'s Ordinal, by the Perſons named in the *Lambeth* Regiſter, and were ordained with that Solemnity, with that Eccleſiaſtical Ceremony, with the Impoſition of Hands of thoſe Perſons; and if beſides he expreſly affirms that our Biſhops were conſecrated by King *Edward*'s Form, and upon that Account declares their Ordination to be illegal; then I may leave it to any one to judge whether all F. *Le Quien*'s great Pains in heaping together ſo many Citations from his Author, to baffle all our *frivolous Diſtictions* and Evaſions,

[o] T. 1. p. 246.

and

and to put the Falſhood of our Regiſter out of diſpute, may not deſerve to be termed (in the Words that this Author uſes of the Proteſtant Ordinations) *mere trifling and ridiculous.*

But it may be ſaid, This however is confeſſed, that *Stapleton* ſays they had not *true Biſhops* Hands laid upon them. He does ſo, and his Ground for ſaying it is, as we ſee in his *Fortreſs of Faith* and *Promptuarium Catholicum*, that *the whole Number of their Paſtors, all the true Biſhops to a Man, were deprived, and none left having Authority to conſecrate Biſhops.* By this it is plain he looked upon the Proteſtant Prelates that ſurvived Queen *Mary* as no Biſhops; but for what Reaſon it does not appear, however it is not difficult to conceive. Their own Hereſy and Schiſm, and their being ordained by Hereticks and Schiſmaticks; their not having the Pope's Confirmation; their being ſome of them ordained by a Ceremonial never uſed before in the Church, and by a Form which he might, tho' he does not ſay ſo, take to be eſſentially defective and inſufficient to confer the Order; their having reſigned their Biſhopricks, or been deprived of them, and not yet reſtored, and conſequently not poſſeſſed of any Epiſcopal Sees; and (not to forget one Reaſon more of Weight with him) their being married, which he thinks enough to reduce any Biſhop to no higher Degree than that of a Layman, as he tells *Horne*[P]: *Voſmet ipſos matrimoniis veſtris contrahendis prorſus* laicos *efficitis.* Theſe might be ſufficient Reaſons with him to look upon them not to be True, or Canonical, or Legal Biſhops. But ſuppoſe he had been in the right, what is the Conſequence? That ſome of them, *Barlow*, *Scory*, *&c.* never laid their Hands upon *Parker*; or, That the laying on of their Hands could not give him a valid

[P] T. 2. p. 1083.

and

and canonical and legal Ordination? The laſt is all the Inference that can be drawn from that Supposal, and it belongs only to the Point of Right, whether *Parker*'s Ordination were valid by Chriſt's Inſtitution, the Canons of the Church, and the Laws of the Land; in all which Reſpects it may be granted that *Stapleton*, in ſome Place or other, takes upon him to reject the Ordination of our Biſhops; but there is not one Paſſage in him, as has been ſhewed, that can be drawn to prove the other Point of Fact, that *Barlow*, *Scory*, *&c.* never laid their Hands on *Parker*, or that the Office preſcribed in King *Edward*'s Ordinal was not performed by thoſe Perſons, in order to confer upon *Parker* the Epiſcopal Character.

CHAP.

CHAP. IX.

State of the Queſtion relating to Harding. Le Quien's *Argument from his declaring that the Proteſtants had no Conſecrated Biſhops. His ſaying ſo does not prove that he denies that they had any* Ordination at all, *but that they were ordained by* true Biſhops. *The* Remarker's *Way of arguing upon the ſame Ground. The Truth examined of what* Harding *ſays, That they had no Conſecrated Biſhops.* Harding's *Queſtions to* Jewell *about his Vocation. His Demand of him to prove his* Right *and* Authority *to execute the Office of Biſhop ſhews he did not intend to deny the Fact of* Jewell's *Ordination.* Harding's *Queſtions no more than theſe two,* How, *and* By Whom, Jewell *was conſecrated.* Le Quien *and the* Remarker *add two more,* When, *and* Where. *Proved fully from the Author's Queſtions to* Jewell, *and his Reaſons for them, that he never had any Thought of denying the Fact (but only the Validity and Lawfulneſs) of* Jewell's *Ordination. The ſame proved from the like Queſtions put by him to himſelf, about his receiving the Order of Deacon in King* Edward's *time.* Le Quien's *Way of arguing from* Harding's *Queſtions to* Jewell. *His* Argument, *That* Harding's *denying* Jewell *was conſecrated by Three Biſhops, ſhews the Regiſter to be falſe, becauſe it gives* Jewell's *Conſecrators the* Title *of Biſhops. The Ridiculouſneſs of this*

Way

Way of reaſoning. The Remarker's *Way of arguing from* Harding's *Queſtions to* Jewell. *His Attempt to prove that* Barlow *was not* Parker's *Conſecrator, by a* Disjunctive, *That either he was not his Conſecrator, or he was not a true Biſhop. His Argument that he was not* Parker's *Conſecrator, from* Harding's *objecting that all the Ordination that* Parker *and the reſt could pretend to was only from* the New Miniſters. *This Argument would be a Proof, that* Parker *and our firſt Biſhops were ordained by none but* themſelves, *according to the Account we have in the* Nag's-Head *Story.* Harding's *Inſtances of other Caſes, which he makes parallel to* Jewell's, *ſhews that he had no Deſign to deny the Fact of his Ordination.*

1. WHat has been ſaid of *Stapleton*, will make it more eaſy to ſhew that *Harding*, who is the other Writer, whoſe Teſtimony they pretend to alledge with ſo great Confidence, cannot be made a Witneſs againſt the Truth of the Account of our firſt Ordinations, in the *Lambeth* Regiſter. The Reader will more clearly ſee it, if he carry in his Mind the State of the Queſtion, the Difference between the Point of Right, That our Biſhops had a valid, or canonical, or legal Ordination; that is, were ordained by ſuch Perſons, and in ſuch Manner, as the Inſtitution of Chriſt and his Apoſtles, the Canons of the Church, or the Laws of the Land, required them to be; and the Point of Fact, "That they were actually ordained according to the Account in the Regiſter, that is, by ſuch Perſons, and in ſuch Manner, as it is related there in the Acts of their Conſecration. That they were not in fact thus ordained,

is

is the Thing which *Le Quien*, and after him the Author of the *Remarks upon F.* Le Courayer, pretend to prove from *Harding*'s Teſtimony, and it is incumbent upon them to prove it, becauſe let that Author ſay what he will of their having no Ordination in the other Reſpects, whether it relate to any eſſential, or canonical, or legal Defect in the Perſons conſecrating, or in the Manner and Form of the Conſecration, it will not amount to a Diſproof of the Truth of the Regiſter, that is, to a Denial of their being ordained by the Perſons named in the Acts of Conſecration, or by the Manner and Form ſet down there. But it will ſoon appear that all that they alledge from *Harding*, comes to no more than that he ſays the Ordinations either were not legal, or not canonical, or at the moſt not true and valid; without his denying that they were in fact ſuch as the Regiſter relates them to be, that is, performed by the Perſons named in the Regiſter, and in the Manner and Form preſcribed by King *Edward*'s Ordinal, as the Acts in the Regiſter relate.

Le Quien, when he is going to produce the Paſſages from *Harding*, tells us[a], *He*, as well as *Stapleton* and *Bonner*, *call in queſtion* our Biſhops *having had any Ordination whatſoever:* And ſays preſently, that *Harding* is the *moſt plain and expreſs, and punctual upon this Article*; *Le plus net & le plus formel*, are his Words, How he is ſo, he proceeds to ſhew: *He proves to the* Engliſh, (*Le Quien* ſays) *that their Epiſcopacy is abſolutely null, becauſe their firſt Biſhops, and eſpecially* Parker *their Metropolitan, were ordained by Perſons who had neither the Epiſcopal Order nor Character.* Let us ſee firſt what Authority he has from the Author to vouch him for this. The Place he cites is in the Beginning almoſt of *Harding*'s Con-

Le Quien's Argument from Harding's declaring that the Proteſtants had no conſecrated Biſhops.

[a] T. 1. p. 289, 290.

futation

futation of the fifth Chapter of the ſecond Part of *Jewell*'s Apology; and his Words there are the Ground of the following Diſpute between him and *Jewell*, about our Orders. I ſhall ſet down the Place at large, with the Words preceding and following *Le Quien*'s Citation. "[b] Whatſoever "ye mean by your Miniſter and that Office, this "we are aſſured of, that in this your New Church, "Biſhops, Prieſts, Deacons, Sub-Deacons, or "any other inferior Orders, ye have none. In "ſaying this I ſpeak not of our Apoſtates, that "be fled from us to your Congregations; who, "as they remain in the Order which they received "in the Catholick Church, ſo being divided and "cut off from the Church, and excommunicate, "lawfully they may not miniſter the Sacraments. "For whereas after the Doctrine of your new "Goſpel, like the Fore-runners of Antichriſt, ye "have abandoned the external Sacrifice and Prieſt-"hood of the *New Teſtament*, and have not in "your Sect conſecrated Biſhops, and therefore "being without Prieſts made with lawful laying "on of Hands, as Scripture requireth, all holy "Orders being given by Biſhops only, how can "ye ſay that any among you can lawfully mini-"ſter, or that ye have any lawful Miniſters at "all?" Here it is plain that he rejects all the Orders of our Church, Biſhops, Prieſts, and Deacons, except of ſuch as came over from their Church to ours, whom he allows to retain the Order which they had received before, but deprives them of a lawful Power to execute the Functions of their Order. It is plain likewiſe that he rejects the Orders of our Prieſts, becauſe they are not ordained to *the Prieſthood of the New Teſtament*, to offer the *external Sacrifice*; and the Orders of both

[b] Jewell's Defence of the Apology, Ann. 1609. p. 119. Harding's Detection, fol. 193. b.

our Biſhops and Prieſts (and Deacons too he might have added) becauſe *we had not in our Sect conſecrated Biſhops, by whom only all holy Orders can be given.* He does therefore declare our Epiſcopacy and Prieſthood to be null; but what does F. *Le Quien* mean by *abſolutely* null? Does he mean really null, and invalid, and of no Effect to confer the Power that ſhould be received in theſe Orders? If he does, this is no more than denying the *Validity* of the Ordination, and not calling the *Fact* in queſtion. Or does he mean null in all reſpects whatſoever, to anſwer what he told us before, that *Harding*, as *Stapleton* and *Bonner* do, *calls in queſtion our Biſhops having any Ordination whatſoever?* If this be his Meaning (as it muſt be to come home to his Point) he has no Authority for it from theſe Words of the Author, and it appears he has not, by his own Confeſſion. *Harding*, he ſays, proves *our Epiſcopacy to be abſolutely null, becauſe our firſt Biſhops, eſpecially* Parker *our Metropolitan, were ordained by Perſons who had not the Epiſcopal Order and Character.* Is this *abſolute Nullity* (as he calls it) a Nullity in all reſpects whatſoever, or in one reſpect only, their having been ordained by Perſons who themſelves were not true Biſhops? Does his Author, or he for him, give any other Reaſon why our Epiſcopacy is null? And can their being ordained by Perſons who were not true Biſhops imply, that "they had no "Ordination whatſoever, no Perſons that laid "Hands upon them, no Solemnity, no Eccleſi-"aſtical Ceremony, no Impoſition of Hands at "all, no Conſecration, either by the *Roman* Pon-"tifical, or ſo much as King *Edward*'s Ordinal, "but that having the Queen's Letters Patents no-"minating them to be Biſhops, they (being true "*Zwinglians*, and *Calviniſts*, and *Eraſtians* all "together) without ſtaying for any thing more "to be done, took Poſſeſſion of their Epiſcopal "Sees?"

This does not prove his denying that they had any Ordination at all, *but that they were ordained by* true Biſhops.

"Sees?" This is *Le Quien*'s Ordination *abſolutely null, no Ordination whatſoever*; which he affirms *Parker* and our firſt Biſhops to have had, and pretends to prove it indiſputably, from the Teſtimonies of *Bonner*, *Stapleton*, *Harding*, *&c.* But how does he prove it from this firſt Teſtimony of *Harding?* He proves it from *Harding*'s ſaying they were ordained by Perſons who had not the *Epiſcopal Order*; his declaring their Epiſcopacy to be null in this reſpect, is (as *Le Quien* would have us believe) declaring it to be null *abſolutely* and in all reſpects. Does it not appear that the *Father* impoſes upon us here with the ſame kind of Sophiſtry which I have before ſhewed he uſes, almoſt in every one of the Places which he alledges from [c] *Stapleton?* that he argues very fallaciouſly, from both theſe Authors ſaying that our Prelates had not the Impoſition of *Biſhops Hands*, to their ſaying that they had no Impoſition of Hands *at all*; from their denying that they were ordained by Biſhops, to their denying that they had any Ordination at all; that is, that they had Hands laid upon them by any Perſons whatſoever, Biſhops, or not.

Beſides, *Le Quien*'s own Words carry their Confutation with them. *Harding*, he ſays, *proves their Epiſcopacy to be null, becauſe they were ordained by Perſons who had neither the Epiſcopal Order nor Character.* Is it poſſible for *Harding* to mean by this that they had no Ordination whatſoever, that is, were not ordained at all by *any Perſons?* Does not his Denial of the Validity of their Ordination, becauſe they were ordained by ſuch Perſons, ſuppoſe that they were ordained by ſuch Perſons? Could he ſay they were ordained by ſuch Perſons, and yet mean that they were ordained by no Perſons? So plainly does *Le Quien*

[c] Sup. p. 261.

make his Author contradict himſelf, by his vain Attempt to make his Denial of the *Validity* paſs for a Denial of the *Fact* of their Ordination.

Let me aſk further, Is not the *Father* diſproving the Account of their Ordination, in the *Lambeth* Regiſter, from *Harding*'s Authority, in order to make him a Witneſs of the Truth of another Relation, which he is willing we ſhould believe to be more authentick, of the Conſecration at the *Nag's-Head?* And does he then make his Author ſay that our firſt Biſhops, and *Parker* eſpecially, were ordained by *Perſons*, by more than *one ſingle* Perſon? Is not this againſt the Faith of Hiſtory, if we allow the Relation in their Hiſtorians, *Sacroboſco*, *Champney*, *&c.* to deſerve that Name? Do they not all agree that there was no Perſon that gave them the Order but *one* only, *Scory* of *Hereford?* except that the firſt imperfect Account in *Conſtable*'s MS. makes him uncertain whether *Barlow* did not aſſiſt *Scory*; but all the reſt that come after *Conſtable* leave out *Barlow*, and make the Conſecrator a ſingle Perſon. Can *Le Quien* pretend that *Parker* was firſt conſecrated alone by himſelf, and ſo might be conſecrated by one Perſon, and then proceed to conſecrate others, and after that have their Aſſiſtance to join with him in conſecrating *Jewell* and the reſt. This is what the *Father* diſcovers ſome Inclination to make us believe, by what he ſays here, *Parker the Metropolitan eſpecially*, That *Parker* was firſt conſecrated at the Tavern alone by himſelf; but the Hiſtory will not admit of it, all the Writers telling us that ſeveral others (tho' with great Difference in the Names and Number) were conſecrated by *Scory* together with *Parker*, at the ſame time. So eaſy is it for a Man of Learning and Judgment to trip or ſtumble very unluckily, when he is not upon even and firm Ground, and when he takes upon him to be an Advocate for a *lying* Story, to

ſhew

ſhew before he is aware, that he has not ſo good a Memory as his Subject requires.

2. The *Remarker* has this Paſſage [d] of *Harding* in full as I have ſet it down; but when he comes to make uſe of it, what he infers from it is in a manner nothing more than that the Author denies the Validity of our Biſhops Ordinations: And the like Inference he makes before [e] from another Paſſage which he cites. But had he ſo ſoon forgot what he had (no more than two Pages almoſt, before theſe two Citations) propoſed for the Subject of all this and the following Section, to prove from [f] *the Objections of the Catholick Controvertiſts, that the* Lambeth *Regiſter is incredible?* Is not this the whole Buſineſs that he takes upon him there? Should not then his Concluſion from theſe and all the other Places which he alledges from *Harding*, be this Propoſition which he firſt laid down, or to the ſame effect, That it is plain from the *Objections* of that *Controvertiſt, that the Regiſter is incredible?* But inſtead of that, we have hitherto nothing more, but that it appears from theſe Objections that *Harding* denies the Validity of the Ordinations, which, if he believed that the Proteſtants had no conſecrated Biſhops, he might deny, and yet confeſs notwithſtanding that the Regiſter is true; that is, that the Perſons who it ſays were (for inſtance) *Jewell*'s and *Parker*'s Conſecrators, acted as true Biſhops (tho' they were none in his Opinion) and laid their Hands upon *Jewell* and *Parker*, and performed the whole Office preſcribed in King *Edward*'s Ordinal for the Conſecration of Arch-Biſhops and Biſhops. So it appears, that the Inference he makes from *Harding*'s Words, is utterly impertinent and unapplicable to his Purpoſe, which was to make uſe of that Wri-

The Remarker's *Way of arguing upon the ſame Ground.*

[d] P. 56, 57. [e] P. 55. [f] P. 53.

ter's Authority to deſtroy the Credit of the Regiſter.

But he has one, his laſt, Inference, which he ſays [g] *is chiefly to be obſerved*, and may ſeem to be more pertinent, and to come near to a Diſproof of the *Fact* of *Parker*'s Ordination. It is that "*ſince Harding* ſays *they have no conſecrated Bi-*"*ſhops*, he muſt either have known that *Barlow* "and *Hodgskins* were never truly conſecrated, or "that they did not perform the Conſecration of "*Parker.*" He muſt either have *known*; his Inference ſhould have been, that thoſe Words of *Harding* imply as much as if he had ſaid, not that they imply he muſt have known it; for he might ſpeak more than he knew, without any Knowledge of the Truth of what he ſaid; or he might ſpeak contrary to his Knowledge, and ſay that which he knew himſelf not to be true; ſo that we are only to conſider what the Words imply that he muſt ſay, and this, if we believe the *Remarker*, is, that *Barlow* and *Hodgskins* were either no true Biſhops, or elſe they were not *Parker*'s Conſecrators. Here it appears that he is ſenſible the thing which he is proving ought to be the Falſhood of the *Lambeth* Regiſter, and he makes Shew of attempting to prove it from *Parker*'s not being conſecrated by two of the Perſons related there to have been his Conſecrators; but does it in a Way peculiar to himſelf, by a *Disjunctive*, That either they were not true Biſhops, or elſe they did not conſecrate *Parker*. The one or other of theſe two he would oblige us to believe upon *Harding*'s Authority; but if we grant him the former, that they were not (in *Harding*'s Opinion) true Biſhops, then we are excuſed from granting the latter, that *Harding* denies them to have been *Parker*'s Conſecrators; and how much nearer are

[g] P. 57, 58.

we

we then to be convinced that *Harding*'s Words are a Diſproof of the Truth of *Parker*'s Regiſter? This is an extraordinary Way of Reaſoning, and much to the *Remarker*'s Purpoſe.

It appears more to be ſo, by his making this disjunctive Propoſition the neceſſary Conſequence from his Author's Words. The Words are, *Ye have not in your Sect conſecrated Biſhops.* The plain and direct Conſequence (if *Harding* ſaid this abſolutely without Exception) is, That, in his Opinion, thoſe Proteſtants, *Barlow* and *Hodgskins*, and the other two that are pretended to have conſecrated *Parker*, and *Parker* himſelf and thoſe that with him are reported to have conſecrated *Jewell* and *Horne*, and the reſt of the Proteſtant Prelates, were not *Conſecrated Biſhops:* Or if we put it in the Disjunctive, the Conſequence is, That either they were not conſecrated Biſhops, or if they were conſecrated Biſhops, then they were not Proteſtants, not *of our Sect.* Theſe are the natural and immediate Conſequences from *Harding*'s Words: But I am at a Loſs how to find that the *Remarker*'s Disjunctive can be a Conſequence, That they *either were not true Biſhops, or elſe they did not conſecrate* Parker *or* Jewell, &c. However, he has ſome Meaning, and to find it out would be a Satisfaction. It ſeems to be, that his Author's Words imply a Denial of *Parker*'s being conſecrated by true Biſhops; conſequently *Barlow* and *Hodgskins*, *&c.* that are reported to be his Conſecrators, either were no true Biſhops, or if they were true Biſhops they did not *perform* Parker's *Conſecration:* now *Harding* knew that *Barlow* and *Hodgskins* had true Conſecration in their Church, conſequently, if he denied that *Parker*'s Conſecrators had true Conſecration, he muſt mean that *Barlow* and *Hodgskins* were none of the Perſons that conſecrated *Parker.* This may look like an Argument: But is not the Ground of *Harding*'s

being made to affirm that *Parker* was not conſecrated by true Biſhops, his ſaying that the Proteſtants had not in *their Sect conſecrated Biſhops?* And were not *Barlow* and *Hodgskins* two of that Sect, that is, Proteſtants? Then it will come to nothing more than that they were, in his Opinion, not conſecrated Biſhops, not but that they might notwithſtanding be *Parker*'s Conſecrators.

The Truth examined of what Harding *ſays, That the Proteſtants had no conſecrated Biſhops.*

But before we leave this Paſſage of *Harding*, it may be proper to conſider his Words a little farther, wherein he appears to affirm poſitively, as a thing certain, that the Proteſtants had not any conſecrated Biſhops of their Sect. If he ſaid this without any Reſerve or Exception, it proves him to be much ſuch a kind of Hiſtorian as his Brother *Stapleton*, [h] who tells us that *all their Biſhops to a Man were deprived, and no one left having Power to conſecrate Biſhops*; forgetting that *Kitchin* of *Landaff* was not deprived, but left with a Power of conſecrating others, and had like to have been *Parker*'s Conſecrator, if the *Nag's-Head* Story be true. And is not *Harding* guilty of the ſame Forgetfulneſs? Does he not call *Landaff* [i] a Fool for coming over to our Sect? and make him for that Reaſon (as *Le Quien* ſays) [k] *a falſe Man, by Apoſtacy and going from his Faith and Religion*; tho' yet he owns him to be (*as he underſtands*) *a true Biſhop by Conſecration?* Could he then, if he thought of this Man, (whom he could not but think of, if he knew any thing of the *Nag's-Head* Story) ſay that we had no conſecrated Biſhops of our Sect, and yet own that *Landaff* came over to our Sect, and that he was a *true Biſhop by Conſecration? Sanders*, after him, ſays *we had not three nor two Biſhops of our Sect conſecrated before by other Biſhops*; and *Fitz-Simon*, that we *had not three, nor two, nor one*, tho' he afterwards corrects him-

[h] Sup. p. 249. [i] Sup. p. 250. [k] Le Quien, T. 1. p. 363.

ſelf,

ſelf, and excepts *Landaff:* But I have ſhewed that what both of them ſay is falſe, and that [l] of ſeven that were in Commiſſion to confirm and conſecrate *Parker*, there were four that performed the Office of confirming and conſecrating him, and that thoſe four were themſelves conſecrated before by other Biſhops. This I need not repeat again to confute *Harding*, becauſe if this were his poſitive Aſſertion, he confutes it himſelf, by owning that one Biſhop, truly conſecrated, came over to our Sect. But to do him Right, he has an Exception that ſaves his Credit in this Particular. His firſt Words almoſt in the Paſſage which we are conſidering, are, that *Biſhops*, *Prieſts*, *Deacons*, &c. *we have none*; the next Words are, [m] *In ſaying this we ſpeak not of our Apoſtates*, &c. of whom he ſays *they remain in the Order which they received, but being cut off from the Church and excommunicate, lawfully they may not miniſter the Sacraments*; that is, not execute the Functions of their Orders. And might not *Barlow* and *Hodgskins*, (the firſt of whom eſpecially had more than once or twice changed his Religion, and gone over firſt from them to the Proteſtants, then relapſed to them in Queen *Mary*'s time, to ſave his Life, and when he was got out of the Realm into a ſafe Place, returned again to the Proteſtant Religion) might not theſe be looked upon by *Harding* to be (beſides *Landaff*) ſome of their *Apoſtate* Biſhops? and then how will the *Remarker* argue from *Harding*'s Words that he denies *Barlow* and *Hodgskins* to be conſecrated Biſhops? That he denies that they could lawfully execute their Functions muſt be granted, as he looked upon them to be ſome of their *Apoſtates*, but then he cannot be concluded to deny that they were conſecrated Biſhops.

[l] Sup. p. 39, 40, 41. [m] Sup. p. 337.

3. To

Harding's *Queſtions to* Jewell *about his Vocation.*

3. To go on now in that Author. Upon the Grounds which he had laid down in the former Paſſage, (That the *Engliſh* Proteſtants had not *the external Sacrifice or Prieſthood of the New Teſtament*, and *that they had not in their Sect conſecrated Biſhops.*) [n] *This being ſo*, he proceeds to *oppoſe* Jewell's *Conſcience*, as he expreſſes it, that is, to put ſome Queſtions to him, firſt about his *Succeſſion*, and then of his *Vocation*. The latter, about his Vocation, are thoſe perplexing and confounding Queſtions, as our Adverſaries take them to be, ſuch as they tell us with the greateſt Confidence that *Jewell* neither could nor durſt anſwer, becauſe he was under a Conviction that he was not conſecrated in ſuch a manner as we pretend now to ſhew from the *Lambeth* Regiſter, but his Conſcience told him that he had really no better Ordination than that at the Tavern. The Words are, " [o] To come to your Vocation; how ſay " you, Sir? You bear yourſelf as tho' you were " Biſhop of *Salisbury*. But how can you prove " your Vocation? By what Authority uſurp you " the Adminiſtration of Doctrine and Sacraments? " What can you alledge for the Right and Proof " of your Miniſtry? Who hath called you? " Who hath laid Hands upon you? By what Ex- " ample hath he done it? How, and by whom, " are you conſecrated? Who hath ſent you? " Who hath committed to you the Office you " take upon you? Be you a Prieſt, or be you " not? If you be not, how dare you uſurp the " Name and Office of a Biſhop? If you be, tell " us who gave you Orders? The Inſtitution of a " Prieſt was never yet but in the Power of a Bi- " ſhop. Biſhops have always after the Apoſtles

[n] Jewell's Defence of the Apol. p. 119. Harding's Detect. f. 193. b. [o] Detect. f. 195. a. Jewell, p. 119.

" time

" time been conſecrated by three other Biſhops, " with the Conſent of the Metropolitan, and " Confirmation of the Biſhop of *Rome.*"

The Reader may obſerve, in the Introduction to the Queſtion, *Who hath called you?* and thoſe that follow, *Jewell* is aſked, " How can you " prove your Vocation? By what *Authority* uſurp " you the Adminiſtration of Doctrine and Sacra- " ments? What can you alledge for the *Right* and " Proof of your Miniſtry?" Here we have a plain Account from the bold Challenger himſelf, what was his Intent. Whether to call in queſtion the *Fact*, or not rather either the *Lawfulneſs*, or the *Validity*, of his Adverſary's Conſecration. He demands to know what *Right* and *Authority* he has to *bear himſelf as if he were Biſhop of* Salisbury? If *Jewell*'s ſhewing that in fact he had received Impoſition of Hands from ſome Perſons, to give him the Epiſcopal Order, would have been a ſufficient Anſwer to this Demand, then we may believe that *Harding*'s Meaning was to call him to an Account as to the *Fact:* But if ſuch an Anſwer would not be ſufficient to prove his *Right* and *Authority*, without proceeding to prove farther that the Perſons who laid Hands upon him were true Biſhops, and qualified, by having the Order themſelves, to confer the ſame Order upon him, with a *Right and Authority* to enter upon the Exerciſe of the Epiſcopal Function; if he was obliged not only to give the Fact in Evidence, but alſo to ſhew that his Conſecrators had Power to give him a lawful and valid Conſecration, then it follows that *Harding*'s Demand was that he ſhould prove the *Validity* and *Lawfulneſs*, and not barely the *Fact* of his Conſecration. *Harding* had juſt before declared that the Proteſtants had no *Conſecrated Biſhops*, nor Perſons qualified to confer the Holy Orders upon any others. Suppoſe now *Jewell*, to ſatisfy his Demand, had produced the

Act

Harding's *Demand for him to prove his* Right *and* Authority *to execute the Office of Biſhop, ſhews he did not intend to deny the Fact of his Ordination.*

Act of his Conſecration, and named the Publick Notaries by whom it was drawn up and ſigned, and every Witneſs that was preſent and was ſtill living, and ready to atteſt that he ſaw and heard the Ceremony of his Conſecration performed; and that thereby he had made it appear that he had in fact Impoſition of Hands from four of the Proteſtant Clergy; would this have been enough to ſilence, or in Reaſon to ſatisfy, his Antagoniſt? Would he not have thought he had good Grounds to ridicule and expoſe that Prelate with his uſual Air of Haughtineſs and Inſolence? "Is this your "Method of proving your Vocation? that you "had Hands laid upon you by ſome of the Pro-"teſtants? Did I not tell you that you had not "one true Biſhop *of your Sect?* And could any "other but a true Biſhop give you a valid Con-"ſecration? P *Could any of your Miniſters, or how-"ſoever elſe you call them, give that to you which "he has not himſelf?* You tell me that ſuch and "ſuch Perſons gave you Ordination: But are "you ſo weak as to think that an Action per-"formed by any ſort of Perſon whatſoever, is, "by virtue of its being done, to be looked up-"on as if it were done by good Authority? And "if it be not done by good Authority, is it of "any Force or Effect? Shew me therefore that "thoſe Perſons were *Conſecrated Biſhops*, and "thereby had Power and Authority to give you "the Order, and then I ſhall not diſpute your "having had from them a true and valid Voca-"tion, and a Right and Authority to act as a "Biſhop in the Church; but otherwiſe you can-"not be looked upon as having received the E-"piſcopal Order or Character, or as having any "Right or Authority to bear your ſelf as if you "were a Biſhop." *Le Quien* may ſee here what

P Detection, fol. 197. a.

ſort

ſort of Reply *Jewell* muſt have had from *Harding* to his Anſwer, if it had been only the Plea of Fact: And how he impoſes upon us, when he ſays more than once, [q] that if he had but produced the *Act of his Conſecration*, it would have effectually *ſtopt the Mouth of his Adverſary*; and ſays the ſame elſewhere [r], that it would have ſilenced *Bonner* and *Stapleton*, if *Horne*'s and *Parker*'s Acts of Conſecration in the Regiſter had been made publick at the proper time.

F. *Le Quien* ſeems to give us this Place of *Harding*'s entire, from his *Confutation of the Apology*, in one continued Citation of the Words in *Engliſh*, except that in the End, after *three Biſhops*, he leaves out thoſe Words (which he might have no Reaſon to add) *with the Conſent of the Metropolitan, and the Confirmation of the Biſhop of* Rome. But if his Tranſcript be compared with mine, it will appear that after the Words, *How can you prove your Vocation?* he [s] leaves out (without telling us that he does it, or the Reaſon why) thoſe two Demands or Queries of *Harding*, *By what Authority, &c.* and *What can you alledge for your Right, &c.* from which I have juſt now been arguing. If my arguing from them be right, we ſee a good Reaſon that might tempt the *Father* to paſs them over in his Citation. He had the whole Paſſage, no queſtion, lying before him; and we may preſume he had conſidered the Parts of it when he read them; and I ſhall only ſay that I believe, that if he had ſeen that thoſe two Clauſes which he omits imply that the Author denies the Fact of *Jewell*'s Conſecration, as clearly as I think I have proved that they have quite another Meaning, he would have given them the ſame Place in his Citation which they have in the Author. The

[q] T. 1. p. 296, 305.
[r] T. 1. p. 233.
[s] T. 1. p. 293.

Remarker

Remarker [t] does ſo, without obſerving that this Part of his Citation makes againſt him: But *Le Quien* was prepared and reſolved to make the Diſpute not to be about the Point of Right but Fact, as we ſhall ſee when we come to his Way of arguing from the Queſtions in the Author.

Harding's *Queſtions no more than two,* How, *and* by Whom, *were you conſecrated.*

4. Theſe Queſtions, *Who hath called you, &c.* tho' to one that is not acquainted with *Harding*'s Talent (of ſpinning out what he has to ſay to a great Length, by a Multiplicity of Words and Variety of Expreſſions to the ſame effect) they may ſeem to be many different Interrogatories, yet they are really but *two* Queſtions, and both comprized by the Author himſelf in this one, *How, and by Whom, are you conſecrated? Who,* with all the Predicates annexed to it, *called you, laid Hands upon you, conſecrated you, ſent you, committed the Office to you,* (except theſe Words ſignify ſo many different particular Acts in the Ceremony of Conſecration) make all together nothing more than this ſingle Queſtion, *Who, or what Perſon,* gave you the Order? The other Queſtion, *How,* with one Variation, *After what Example,* is no more than, *In what Manner* did he give you the Order? The Author, as I ſaid, gives us, as a Queſtion diſtinct from the reſt, both theſe two put together, *How, and by Whom, are you conſecrated?* Which Queſtion might have gone alone by itſelf to as good Purpoſe, and have ſaved ſo much of his Pains, and as much of the Reader's Trouble; but it would not then have made a Shew of as many Proofs as there were Queſtions, againſt *Jewell*'s Ordination, and either of fully convincing, or of perplexing, diſtracting, and utterly confounding his unhappy Adverſary. But I have another Reaſon to be willing to ſhew the

[t] P. 58.

Reader

Reader that there are no more than *two* Queſtions, becauſe our preſent *Controvertiſts*, *Le Quien* and the *Remarker*, take upon them to enlarge the Number. The former adds one, the Queſtion [v] *When?* and the latter two, [w] *When?* and *Where?* If we aſk what Authority they have from *Harding* for theſe Additions, they muſt be more ſilent than they pretend that *Jewell* is in his Anſwer to *Harding*'s Queſtions; for there is not a Word in the Queſtions above ſet down of *When*, or *Where*. If it be ſaid they ſpeak of others that aſk theſe *Queſtions*, and not of *Harding*, the Caſe will rather be worſe; for *Stapleton* [x] does not appear to aſk any other but the Queſtion, *Who*; that is, What True Biſhops? And *Bonner* much the ſame, *What Arch-Biſhop, or four Biſhops?* Neither have they any Precedent from the Writers before them. *Fitzherbert* [y], who is the firſt that ſhewed them this Way of managing the Argument, ſays no more but that *Harding* and *Stapleton urged* Jewell *and* Horne *to ſhew How, and by Whom, they were made Biſhops*. And the very Author of the [z] *Nullity of the Prelatick Clergy*, ſays that their *Catholick Doctors*, Stapleton, Harding, &c. *preſſed our Prelates frequently and earneſtly to make good their Conſecration, to ſhew How, and by Whom, they received the Epiſcopal Order*. So that theſe two additional Queſtions, which make the Number double to what it is in any before them, are the Fruit of *Le Quien*'s and the *Remarker*'s own Invention, who were not willing the Argument ſhould want any Improvement as it paſſed thro' their Hands; and the latter had a very good Meaning in the Addition of the Queſtion *Where?* that the credulous Reader might be led into a Belief, that our Biſhops durſt not anſwer this Queſtion about the

Le Quien *and the* Remarker *add two more,* When, *and* Where.

[v] T. 1. p. 248. [w] P. 54. [x] Sup. p. 249, 260.
[y] Sup. p. 235. [z] Preface, N. 11.

Place,

Place, for fear of being obliged to confeſs that they had their Conſecration not at *Lambeth*, but at the *Nag's-Head*.

That Harding *never had any Thought of denying the Fact (but only the Validity and Lawfulneſs) of* Jewell's *Ordination proved fully from his Queſtions and his Reaſons for them.*

4. But to come now to conſider *Harding*'s two Queſtions, (for the firſt, as I have ſhewed, however multiplied in the Expreſſion, is no more than one) we are to ſee whether they imply a Denial of the *Fact* of *Jewell*'s Conſecration, or of his being either *canonically* and *lawfully*, or *truly* and *validly* conſecrated: And I hope I ſhall make it appear that the Words do not neceſſarily imply a Denial of the former, but may be interpreted of his denying only the latter, which is enough for our Purpoſe; but I ſhall ſhew beſides, that *Harding* certainly meant in theſe Queſtions to deny not the *Fact*, but either the *Lawfulneſs* or the *Validity* of his Adverſary's Conſecration. I may aſk touching the firſt Queſtion, as I did in *Stapleton*'s Caſe[a], Is it, Had you any Call, or Miſſion, or Impoſition of Hands, or Conſecration, from any Perſon? As if *Harding* meant, that *Jewell* had no Perſon at all that called, or ſent, or laid Hands upon, or conſecrated him. Or is it, Who was the Perſon? The very Words ſhew the Queſtion is, *Who called you? Who laid Hands upon you, &c.* that is, *What Perſon?* And muſt this Queſtion neceſſarily mean, What are the *Names* of the Perſons? Can you tell me the *Names* of your Conſecrators? As if he meant, There was no Perſon that he could name. Or may it mean, Of what *Degree* and *Order* in the Church were the Perſons that conſecrated you? Were they Laicks, or Deacons, or Presbyters, or were they Biſhops, that had the Epiſcopal Order themſelves? Pray ſhew who they were, that we may ſee whether they were *true Biſhops*, Perſons qualified to give you a *valid*

[a] Sup. p. 260.

Conſe-

Conſecration? If the Queſtion may admit of this Senſe (and I may defy *Le Quien* or any Body elſe to ſhew that it is not capable of it) then it puts an End to the Diſpute, whether it muſt neceſſarily be underſtood in the other Senſe; and if it is not neceſſarily to be underſtood in that Senſe, then it muſt be granted that the Words do not neceſſarily imply a Denial of the *Fact* in regard to the Perſons, becauſe they may only imply a Denial either of the *Validity* or the *Lawfulneſs* of *Jewell*'s Conſecration by thoſe Perſons. The like may be ſaid of the other Queſtion, *How, and after what Example, were you conſecrated?* I may aſk, Muſt the Meaning of it neceſſarily be (as *Le Quien* would have it) Had you any Rite or Ceremony, or Solemnity, uſed at your Conſecration? As if he meant, You had none; but were conſecrated without Solemnity, and without any Eccleſiaſtical Ceremony whatſoever. Or may it not mean, What was the Rite and Ceremony uſed at your Conſecration? Was it the Ceremony authorized by the Rules and Practice of the Church, and a Form proper and ſufficient to confer the Order? Or was it a Rite and Ceremony of your own, ſet up in Oppoſition to the Church's Order and Practice, and a Form improper and inſufficient to confer the Order? In a Word, Was it the *Roman* Pontifical, or your own New Ordinal? It cannot be denied but this might have been the Author's Meaning; and this implies nothing but a Denial of the Validity and Lawfulneſs of his Conſecration, in regard to the Form: And if this might have been his Meaning, it follows that he could not neceſſarily mean the other, nor that the Queſtion neceſſarily implies a Denial of the Fact, as to the Form.

This is what appears from the Words of the Queſtions themſelves: But it is very eaſy to prove from the Author's Words here and elſewhere, that

his Intent might be, and that it certainly was his Intent, only to call *Jewell* to an account whether he were either canonically and lawfully, or truly and validly conſecrated, and not to call him to an account about the Fact of his Conſecration. For, firſt, he had but a few Lines before told *Jewell*, *You have no Conſecrated Biſhops*; and then goes on upon that Ground in this manner, *This being ſo, let me put to your Conſcience ſome Queſtions*; and when he comes to his Vocation, he puts this Queſtion to him, *Who hath called, or ſent, or laid Hands upon you, or conſecrated you?* Does not this Queſtion prove that he meant that *Jewell* could not ſhew that he had a Call, Miſſion, Impoſition of Hands, or Conſecration, from any that were *Conſecrated Biſhops?* That is, from any Perſons that were qualified to give him a canonical and lawful, or a true and valid Conſecration. 'Tis as much as if he had ſaid, You have not one Biſhop truly conſecrated; but none but a Biſhop truly conſecrated could give you a lawful, or a true and valid Conſecration; conſequently you cannot have had any lawful, or any true or valid Conſecration. Here we ſee the plain Force of what he ſays upon this Ground, ſuppoſing that he means to deny that *Jewell* was lawfully or validly conſecrated. But take it the other Way, that he meant to deny his being at all conſecrated in fact, that is, his having Hands laid upon him by any Perſon whatſoever, or particularly by *Parker*, *Grindall*, *Cox* and *Hodgskins*, related in the Regiſter to be his Conſecrators; let us now ſee the Force of what he ſays upon this Ground. It is the ſame as if he ſhould ſay, *You have no conſecrated Biſhops*; conſequently no Perſon whatſoever (not only no Biſhop, but) no Preſbyter, Deacon, or Laick, particularly *Parker*, *Grindall*, *&c.* can ever have laid Hands upon you. This, if it be a good Conſequence, is a plain and well-

well-grounded Denial of the *Fact*. But is it poſſible for *Harding*, if he was in his Senſes, to argue thus upon this Ground? The Ground for this Conſequence could not be that the Proteſtants had no Biſhops; but that they had no Perſons whatſoever, Laicks, Deacons, or Presbyters, that could take upon them to lay their Hands upon *Jewell*'s Head, pretending to give him the Order of Biſhop. But can *Harding*'s ſaying that the Proteſtants had no Biſhops, imply that they had no other Perſons in the Church, Laicks, Deacons or Presbyters? Or that none of thoſe Laicks, Deacons or Presbyters, particularly ſuch as *Parker*, *Grindal*, *&c.* could lay their Hands upon *Jewell*, pretending to make him a Biſhop? If it is not poſſible, for *Harding*'s ſaying that We had no Biſhops, to imply this, then it is not poſſible for him to draw this Conſequence from that Ground, or to mean to deny the Fact of *Jewell*'s Ordination, in the Queſtion, *Who laid Hands upon you?* which he puts to him upon this Ground. 'Tis true, that if no Body at all laid Hands upon *Jewell*, he had not the Impoſition of Hands of any Biſhop; but his not having the Impoſition of a Biſhop's Hands will not imply that he had no Impoſition of Hands from any Body elſe; and that is what it muſt imply, if his ſaying, The Proteſtants had no Biſhops, be a Ground for him to deny the Fact of *Jewell*'s Conſecration.

Let the Reader now obſerve with me, that this is the Ground which *Harding* lays down, both for theſe Queſtions, and for his whole Diſpute againſt *Jewell*, about the Point of his having the Epiſcopal Order. Let him obſerve likewiſe, that from the firſt Appearance of the *Nag's-Head* Story, *Fitzherbert*, *Champney*, and all the other Abettors of that ſenſeleſs and ſcandalous Fable, inſiſt upon it that in this Diſpute, and eſpecially in theſe Queſtions, *Harding* denies that *Jewell* was

in fact conſecrated as the Regiſter relates; but rather affirms that he had no Ordination but at that Tavern. And I hope the Reader ſees now, without going farther, a clear Proof, from the very Ground of theſe Queſtions, and of the whole Diſpute, that *Harding* not only might not, but could not, mean by theſe Queſtions to deny that *Jewell* was in fact conſecrated as the Regiſter relates, but only to deny that he was lawfully and validly conſecrated.

Secondly, after his Queſtions to him about his being no Biſhop, he calls him to a farther Account about his Prieſthood. *Be you a Prieſt, or be you not? ——if you be, tell us who gave you Orders?* The Queſtion, Who gave you Prieſt's Orders? implies that *Harding* denies *Jewell* to have been ever ordained Prieſt, as much as the other, *Who conſecrated you?* implies a Denial of his having ever been conſecrated Biſhop. But does it imply a Denial of his having in fact Hands laid upon him to ordain him Prieſt, or not rather of his having had true and valid Impoſition of Hands to confer upon him the Order of Prieſthood? This Point is preſently decided, by the Words that immediately follow, *The Inſtitution of a Prieſt was never yet but in the Power of a Biſhop:* That is, the Inſtitution of a Prieſt is an Act appropriated to the Epiſcopal Authority, and cannot either lawfully or validly be performed by any but a Biſhop. Upon this Reaſon he might very well ſay that *Jewell* was never lawfully or validly ordained Prieſt, becauſe, in *Harding*'s Opinion, he had not Hands laid upon him by one that had Authority to do it, and could lawfully and validly lay Hands upon him, that is, by a Biſhop. But could he be ſo ſenſeleſs and abſurd as, upon this Reaſon, That none but a Biſhop had Authority to lay Hands upon him, to deny that in fact any Perſon whatſoever (not Biſhop, but) Presbyter, Deacon,

Deacon, or Laick, could take upon them to lay Hands upon *Jewell*, to make him Prieſt? This would imply that he muſt mean, that it was not only unlawful and to no effect, but abſolutely *impoſſible*, for any Perſon but a Biſhop (any Laick, Deacon, or Presbyter) to lay Hands upon him. Apply it to another Caſe, and it will ſoon appear that *Harding* could not be ſo abſurd. In the very next Page of the *Detection*, he alledges againſt *Jewell* the Caſe of *Iſchyras*, ordained Prieſt by *Colluthus*, who was no more than Prieſt himſelf. It was not at that time, if *it never was, in the Power of any but a Biſhop to ordain a Prieſt.* Could then *Harding*, upon this Reaſon, deny that *Iſchyras* had in fact Hands laid upon him by *Colluthus?* We ſee he owns it to be Fact, that he had Impoſition of Hands from *Colluthus*, and yet denies that he was validly ordained Prieſt, for this Reaſon, becauſe *Colluthus* was no Biſhop, and conſequently had no Power to ordain him, tho' he did in fact lay his Hands upon him for that Purpoſe. *Iſchyras*'s Caſe he brings for a Parallel to *Jewell*'s Caſe; and it was exactly ſo in regard to *Jewell*'s Ordination to the Prieſthood, ſuppoſing (as *Harding* conceived) that *Jewell* had no Biſhop's Hands laid upon him. If therefore this could be no Reaſon to deny the Fact of *Iſchyras*'s Ordination, it muſt be very abſurd in *Harding* to make it a Reaſon to deny the Fact of *Jewell*'s Ordination, that is, to deny that he was ordained by any ſuch Perſon as *Colluthus*, by ſome Perſon that preſumed to lay Hands upon him, tho' he had no Authority to ordain him; that is, he was (in *Harding*'s Opinion) no Biſhop. So we have another Proof from *Harding*'s own Words, that he could not mean by his Queſtion to *Jewell*, *Who gave you Prieſt's Orders?* nor conſequently by his Queſtion, *By whom were you conſecrated Biſhop?* to deny the Fact, but only the Lawfulneſs or Validity of his

Ordination to the Prieſthood, and Conſecration to the Epiſcopal Order.

I paſſed over what *Harding* ſays, upon Suppoſition that *Jewell* had not been ordained Prieſt, *If you be not* a Prieſt, *how dare you uſurp the Name and Office of a Biſhop?* If he means, that he could not validly be ordained Biſhop, without being firſt ordained Prieſt, he is much miſtaken; but if he means it could not be done by the Canons of the Church, that is, he could not canonically be admitted to the Epiſcopal Order *per ſaltum*, without paſſing thro' the intermediate Degrees, that may be true; and it means only that he was not lawfully made Biſhop: But take it either Way, it implies no Denial of the Fact, but of the Validity or Lawfulneſs of his Admiſſion to the Epiſcopal Order.

Thirdly, *Harding*, in the very next Words, ſays, *Biſhops have always after the Apoſtles time, according to the Eccleſiaſtical Canons, been conſecrated by three other Biſhops.* This implies a Denial of *Jewell*'s having received Conſecration from three Biſhops. But how will this affect his Conſecration in point of Fact? His being not conſecrated by three Biſhops, will not neceſſarily imply his not having Hands laid upon him by any or by three or more Perſons who were not Biſhops; and if it will not, then it is conſiſtent with his having Hands laid upon him by one, or three, or more ſuch Perſons; and ſo it does not imply a Denial of the Fact of ſuch a Conſecration, but only of its being a valid or lawful Conſecration. Neither will it imply that he had not Hands laid upon him by two, or at leaſt by one Biſhop; but only that he had not three, the canonical Number: And ſo it does not imply a Denial of ſo much as a valid Conſecration, but only of its being lawful and canonical. As the Ground of the Queſtion before, *Who conſecrated you?* is, that the Proteſtants had

no

no Conſecrated Biſhops, it implies a Denial of *Jewell*'s having a true and valid Conſecration, tho' not of the Fact: But the Reaſon he gives for the Queſtion, in the Words now ſet down, does not imply either a Denial of his being conſecrated in fact, nor of his being validly and truly conſecrated, but only of his having a lawful Conſecration according to the Canons of the Church. However, it is plain that in theſe Words, *Biſhops have always, &c.* the Author is giving a Reaſon for his calling in queſtion *Jewell*'s Conſecration to the Epiſcopal Order, as in the Words juſt before, *The Inſtitution of a Prieſt, &c.* he gives a Reaſon why he calls in queſtion his Ordination to the Prieſthood: And he may mean Biſhops have always, if they had a valid Conſecration, had Impoſition of Hands from ſome Biſhop or Biſhops, and if lawfully according to the Canons of the Church, by no fewer than by three Biſhops. And this would be a very good Reaſon for him to deny the Validity and Lawfulneſs of his Adverſary's Conſecration, as, in his Opinion, he had not Hands laid upon him by three, nor ſo much as one Biſhop. But it is not poſſible he could be ſo weak and abſurd as to make this a Reaſon for his denying him to have had in fact any Hands laid upon him; becauſe we muſt then ſuppoſe him to argue againſt *Jewell* in this manner, You could not validly and lawfully have Impoſition of Hands to conſecrate you, but from ſome Biſhop, and from three Biſhops; conſequently, You never had Hands laid upon you by any three Perſons, or one Perſon whatſoever, of whatſoever other Degree in the Church, whether Laick, Deacon or Presbyter. So it appears once more from his own Words, that he could not without the greateſt Abſurdity have it in his Thoughts to deny the Fact of *Jewell*'s Conſecration.

But before we paſs from theſe Words, we are to aſk, What three Biſhops the Canons require to make a lawful Conſecration? Do they allow of any Perſons, provided they bear themſelves as Biſhops, and aſſume the Name and Title of Biſhops, or are reputed to be Biſhops, or have the Name and Title given them (perhaps) in the publick Acts and Records of the Church or State? It may very juſtly ſeem ridiculous to put ſuch a Queſtion, as if it were poſſible that the Canons ſhould be underſtood to mean any other Perſons but ſuch as are (not in Name or Title only, but) really and truly Biſhops; that is, have been themſelves before validly conſecrated by other true Biſhops: But the Reader will ſee there is Reaſon for ſuch a Queſtion, when he comes to *Le Quien*'s Argument from this Paſſage in the Author, which he will find has no better Ground than ſuch a Gloſs as this, which either *Harding*, or *Le Quien* for him, makes upon the Canons of the Church in this Particular.

Fourthly, I ſhewed before [b], that it was the Author's Intent to call in queſtion, not the Fact but the Lawfulneſs or Validity of his Adverſary's Conſecration, from his two Demands, which are a Preface to the following Queſtions, or may be ſaid to be the firſt Part of them, *viz.* his requiring *Jewell* to ſhew his *Authority*, and *Right*, to *bear himſelf as Biſhop of* Salisbury; which Demands if *Jewell* had anſwered by the Fact of his Conſecration, I have ſhewed (tho' *Le Quien* ſays it would have ſtopt *Harding*'s Mouth) how very much it would have given him an Occaſion to expoſe and inſult that Prelate [c], inſtead of owning himſelf to be ſatisfied with his Anſwer. Theſe Demands, to make Proof of his Right and Authority, ſhew the Meaning of the Queſtions immediately fol-

[b] Sup. p. 347. [c] Sup. p. 348.

lowing,

lowing, all compriſed in this one, *How, and by Whom, were you conſecrated?* To give a ſatisfactory Anſwer to theſe Queſtions, he was to ſhew that he was conſecrated by ſuch Perſons, and in ſuch Manner, as could effectually give him a Right and Authority to take upon him the Office of a Biſhop. But could it be a ſatisfactory Anſwer, that he had Hands laid upon him, to conſecrate him Biſhop, by four Perſons, *Parker*, (ſuppoſe) *Grindal*, *&c*, and that they performed the Office by the Form in King *Edward*'s Ordinal; from which Perſons, and by which Form, *Harding* would preſently tell him he could not receive any Right or Authority to act as a Biſhop, thoſe Perſons being no Biſhops themſelves, and ſo uncapable of giving him ſuch Right and Authority; and the Form unlawful and invalid, and ſo inſufficient to convey that Right and Authority to him? Something more therefore muſt be required to give his Adverſary a ſatisfactory Anſwer, *viz.* to ſhew that thoſe Perſons were true Biſhops, and the Form valid and lawful; and to prove thereby, that in both reſpects he was validly and lawfully conſecrated, and had received that Right and Authority which *Harding* here calls in queſtion. It is plain therefore from theſe Demands, that the Meaning of the Queſtions immediately after them is to deny *Jewell*'s having had Impoſition of Hands from true Biſhops, and his being conſecrated by a Form ſuch as *Harding* eſteemed the *Roman* Pontifical to be, the only lawful and valid Form; ſo that it was not his Meaning to deny the Fact of *Jewell*'s having Hands laid upon him by any Perſon whatſoever, or particularly by *Parker*, *Grindal*, *&c.* but of his having the Impoſition of Biſhops Hands, ſuch as he denied them or any other *Engliſh* Proteſtants to be; nor to deny his being conſecrated by any Form, or particularly by King *Edward*'s Ordinal, ſuch a Form as *Harding* looked upon

upon to be unlawful and invalid; but of his being conſecrated by the only lawful and valid Form, in *Harding*'s Opinion, the *Roman* Pontifical.

The ſame thing, Fifthly, is farther clear from a Place in the Author which *Le Quien* himſelf cites [b], as full for his own Purpoſe, and puts it immediately before the Queſtions, as in a manner of the ſame Import with them; "If your Vocation be ordinary, ſhew us the Letters of your Orders. At leaſt ſhew us that you have received Power to do the Office you preſume to exerciſe, by due Order of laying on of Hands and Conſecration. But Order and Conſecration you have not. For who could give that to you, of all theſe New Miniſters, howſoever elſe you call them, which he hath not himſelf?" Here his Demand of a Sight of *Jewell*'s Letters of Orders may at firſt reading appear to be very much to the Purpoſe, to ſhew that he calls in queſtion the *Fact* of his Ordination. Let me aſk therefore, If *Jewell*, in Compliance with this Demand, and to prove that he had the ordinary Vocation to the Prieſthood, had produced Letters Teſtimonial under the Hand and Seal of the Perſon that ordained him Prieſt; and to prove his having the ordinary Call to the Office of Biſhop, had produced the Act of his Conſecration, atteſted by Publick Notaries, and Depoſitions ſworn to by all the Perſons who were preſent at his Conſecration, and Letters beſides under the Hands and Seals of his Conſecrators; would not his Adverſary, after his taking all this Pains, have told him he could not but laugh heartily at ſuch a ſilly and ridiculous Way of making Proof of his Vocation, and have given him the like Reaſons for it as I ſaid before [c]? Or does he not here beforehand

[b] T. 1. p. 292, 293. Detect. f. 197. a. [c] Sup. p. 248.

plainly

plainly tell him, that ſuch an Anſwer would be inſufficient, and do him no Service? *Jewell* would have ſhewed him by the Act of his Conſecration, *&c.* that he had Hands laid upon him by *Parker*, *Grindal*, *Cox*, and *Hodgskins:* But does he not in effect return upon him, "This will by "no means ſatisfy me that you have received "Power to do theſe Offices you preſume to exer-"ciſe, by due Order, and laying on of Hands, "and Conſecration? I muſt ſtill ſay, Order and "Conſecration you have not. You pretend to "have had it from ſuch as you name of your "*New Miniſters*, but how could any one of them "give you that Order and Conſecration which "he has not himſelf?" The Method that *Jewell* is ſuppoſed to take, muſt have put *Harding* to Silence, if it had been enough for him to make Proof of the Fact of his Conſecration; but we ſee plainly what Reply *Harding* had ready to make, if *Jewell* had given ſuch an Anſwer. But there needs no more than to compare what *Harding* ſays with the Reaſon which he gives for it, to ſhew that it certainly could not be his Meaning to deny the Fact of *Jewell*'s Conſecration. He ſays, *Order and Conſecration you have not.* If he meant that he had no Order or Conſecration in point of Fact, then his Reaſon ſhould have been to this Effect: For who of our Old Prelates, or of your New Miniſters, ever laid their Hands upon you for your Conſecration? But his Reaſon is, Who of your New Miniſters could give you a lawful and valid Conſecration? Is the Senſe of this, None of your New Miniſters ever laid their Hands upon you: Or is it not to this Purpoſe, Suppoſing, or even granting, that ſome of your New Miniſters laid Hands upon you, yet they could not lawfully or validly conſecrate you, becauſe they never were conſecrated themſelves. Does not this ſhew that he rather allows, and almoſt even

even confeſſes, the Fact? ſo far is he from denying it.

But then I may be aſked, What can be the Meaning of thoſe Words, *Shew us the Letters of your Orders*; had not his Words ſome Meaning or other? Yes they had; but not this Meaning. Shew us your Letters of Orders, if you can make it appear by them that you had any Conſecrators at all, that any either of our Old Biſhops or your New Miniſters laid Hands upon you? This cannot be his Meaning, as I have ſhewed. But it muſt be, Shew us your Letters of Orders, and then it will appear that you had not Hands laid upon you by any of the Old True and Lawful Biſhops, who, and none elſe, could have given you a true and valid Conſecration; but by ſome of your own New Proteſtant Miniſters, who were no Biſhops, and conſequently could not either validly or lawfully conſecrate you. So I hope I have made it plain from this Place, that *Harding* not only might not, but could not have any ſuch Meaning as to deny the Fact of *Jewell*'s Conſecration.

The ſame thing proved from his Queſtions to himſelf about his receiving the Order of Deacon in King Edward's *time.*

5. There is ſtill behind, in the laſt Place, a Proof that he might not, and (I think) that he could not, have that Meaning, from another Place in his *Detection*; and we are obliged for the Diſcovery to the Author himſelf, who ſuggeſts to us this plain Proof of that which I think I may ſay is demonſtrable from his Words. In the fourth Book of his *Detection* he does not think it to be enough to print theſe Queſtions to *Jewell* but once, in the Beginning; but fills almoſt another whole Page [d] afterwards, with a Repetition of every thing that he had ſaid there before relating to them, Word for Word. His Reaſons

[d] Detection, fol. 230. a.

for

for it appear to be, to *put* Jewell *in mind of his Words* pretended to be *yet unanſwered*; and beſides, to tell him that thoſe very Queſtions, which he now offered to him in the *Detection* a ſecond time, touching his Orders of Biſhop and Prieſt, he had once formerly propoſed to himſelf, in regard to his own Deacon's Orders, which he had received in King *Edward*'s time. If they were the ſame Queſtions, then he muſt have put it to his own Conſcience, *Who called, ſent, laid Hands upon, and ordained him* to be Deacon, and *committed that Office to him?* That is the firſt Queſtion. The other is, *How, and after what Example, was it done?* If then we find what certainly was his Meaning when he put theſe Queſtions to himſelf, we ſhall then know as certainly (only putting Biſhop or Prieſt in the Place of Deacon) what his Meaning was in the ſame Queſtions when he put them to *Jewell*. And this the very Words of his Anſwer make very plain. It is, "[e] I eſteemed not the Title of any Miniſtry "which I might ſeem to have received in King "*Edward*'s time, ſo much as I ſhould have done "if I had received it of a Catholick Biſhop, "and after the Order of the Catholick Church; "being well aſſured that thoſe who took upon "them to give Orders, were altogether out of "Order themſelves, and miniſtred them not ac-"cording to the Rite and Manner of the Catho-"lick Church, as who had forſaken the whole "Succeſſion of Biſhops in *Chriſtendome*, and had "created a New Congregation of their own "planting, the Form whereof was imagined on-"ly in their own Brains, and had not been ſeen "nor practiſed in the World before." This Anſwer implies that he knew that he had in Appearance and in *Title received the Miniſtry and Or-*

[e] Detection, fol. 231. 2.

der

der of Deacon, in that Reign, from one or more of thoſe Perſons who at that time *took upon them to give Orders*. This he means by the Words *receiving the Title of his Miniſtry*, and his *ſeeming to have received it*, that he had in Appearance and *Title* received that Order, by having the Hands of one or more ſuch Perſons laid upon him. And if he knew this to be Fact, he could not have any Thought of denying or diſputing the Fact; that is, that one or more ſuch Perſons laid Hands upon him, and took upon them to give him the Order. But then he ſays he was *well aſſured* thoſe Perſons *were altogether out of Order themſelves*; by that he means either that they were themſelves unordained, and had not the Order they pretended to, that is, of Biſhops, agreeably to *Champney*'s[f] rendring of the Words in *Latin*, *erant omnino ſine Ordine*; and then his Meaning is plainly, that being no Biſhops they neither did nor could give him a true or valid Ordination. Or he may mean by their being *out of Order*, that they were not *Catholick Biſhops*, but ſuch as *had forſaken the whole Succeſſion of Biſhops in* Chriſtendome, *and erected a New Congregation of their own planting*, *&c.* and then his Meaning is that they were Schiſmaticks, and had cut themſelves off from the Church by their Separation, and were thereby rendered uncapable of giving him a lawful Ordination. So it is certain from his own Anſwer to the Queſtion *Who laid Hands upon him*, that he could not mean by it to deny or diſpute the Fact, but either the Validity or Lawfulneſs of his Calling to the Order of Deacon.

His Anſwer to the other Queſtion *How, and after what Example*, is the ſame. It implies a Confeſſion that the Order was in fact miniſtred to him by that Perſon or Perſons who took upon

[f] De Vocatione Miniſtrorum, p. 461.

them

them to give him the Order; but that he was aſſured that it was not miniſtred to him *after the Order, or according to the Rite and Manner, of the Catholick Church*, but by a Ceremony *imagined* (as he ſays *the whole Form of their New Congregation* was) *only in their own Brains, which had not been ſeen or practiſed in the World before.* From this Anſwer it is as certain, that he knew very well that the Order of Deacon was not miniſtred to him without any Solemnity or Ceremony at all, neither according to the *Roman* Pontifical, nor the New Ordinal, but that it was miniſtred to him by the Ceremonial preſcribed in the latter; and this he means was unlawfully done, being contrary to the Order, Uſe, and Practice of the *Roman* Church, as that Ceremonial was introduced in Oppoſition to that Church's Authority and Practice. So his Anſwer to the Queſtion *How, and after what Example*, proves that he had no Thoughts of diſputing the Fact, that is, his having received the Order after any Rite or Manner at all, or not by the Rite and Manner preſcribed by King *Edward*'s Ordinal; but of the Lawfulneſs, as he doubted or apprehended that he was ordained by a Ceremonial which could not be lawfully uſed; that is, knew that he was ordained Deacon in King *Edward*'s time, by his Ordinal, but put it to his own Conſcience to conſider, Whether that could be looked upon to be a lawful Form; and found Reaſon, when he had (as he ſays) *well conſidered* the Queſtion, to reſolve in the Negative, that it could not.

His very Words in telling his Adverſary that the Queſtions which he now put him, were the ſame that he had formerly put to his own Conſcience, imply that he looked upon *Jewell*'s Caſe, as to the Want of Ordination, (allowing for the Difference of Time, and of the reſpective Orders) to be the ſame as his own, and liable to the ſame Ob-

Objections. If therefore his Objections to *Jewell* imply that he meant *Jewell* had no Conſecration in fact, the ſame to himſelf muſt imply that he had in fact no Ordination, notwithſtanding that he owns plainly that he had an Ordination from ſome Perſons that took upon them at that time to give Orders. If he himſelf owns, notwithſtanding thoſe Objections, that he was ordained in fact, then, if he makes both their Caſes the ſame, he muſt be conceived to own that *Jewell* was ordained and conſecrated in fact, tho' he declares his Ordination and Conſecration to be invalid or unlawful; he muſt mean that *Jewell ſeemed to receive the Miniſtry* of Prieſt and Biſhop, and did in fact receive *the Title* of thoſe Orders from ſome Perſons that in King *Edward*'s and Queen *Elizabeth*'s Reign took upon them to give Orders; and he muſt mean that they miniſtred thoſe Orders to *Jewell* by a Ceremonial *imagined in the Brains of the* firſt Reformers, and *never practiſed before*; that is, according to the Rite and Manner of King *Edward*'s Ordinal. All this he muſt be conceived to grant to have been Matter of Fact (*mutatis mutandis*) in *Jewell*'s Caſe as well as his own. As the Queſtions were the ſame, both to *Jewell* and to himſelf, ſo his Anſwers muſt be conceived to be in *Jewell*'s Name as well as his own, That they both were ordained by ſome that took upon them to confer the reſpective Orders, but that thoſe Perſons were either unordained themſelves, or rendered incapable by their Schiſm to execute their Office lawfully, and ſo their Acts in ordaining him and *Jewell* were either invalid or unlawful; and That they both were ordained by the ſame Form of King *Edward* (allowing for the Differences in the reſpective Ordinations) but that the Uſe of that Form, and conſequently the Ordinations according to it, were unlawful.

Suppoſe

Suppoſe the worſt, that *Harding* knew that there was a great Difference between their two Caſes, much to *Jewell*'s Diſadvantage, can it be conceived that he would ſo much favour his Adverſary as to give up the main Strength of his own Cauſe, and diſſemble or conceal this greateſt Flaw, or Blot, or abſolute Nullity, in his Ordination? Would not he have told him and the World, that for his own Part, it was true that he had been ordained Deacon by Perſons that could not give him either a lawful or valid Ordination, and by an unlawful Form; but for his Adverſary, he never had any Impoſition of Hands at all, but when he was Deacon; nor was ever ordained Prieſt, or conſecrated Biſhop, by any Perſons whatſoever, nor had any Solemnity, any Eccleſiaſtical Ceremony at all in his Ordination to the Prieſthood, or Conſecration to the Epiſcopal Order; but that if he had any Conſecration to the latter, it was, *&c.*-- I leave to *Le Quien* or the *Remarker* to paſs on, if they pleaſe, to their *Nag's-Head* Ordination.

I ſhould not omit that *Harding* ſays he put thoſe Queſtions to *Jewell*, *in hopes that as they had moved him, they might move* Jewell *alſo*; that is, have brought him to the ſame Confeſſion as that to which they had brought himſelf. But what then muſt they have moved *Jewell* to confeſs? that he had in fact no Ordination by any Perſons, or by any Ceremony whatſover? No, we ſee this is not that which *Harding* confeſſes; but that expreſly, as to his own, and by Implication in *Jewell*'s Caſe, he affirms the contrary, that they were both ordained in fact, though he grants that neither of them had, in reſpect of the Perſons, or of the Manner, a valid and lawful Ordination.

6. And ſo I hope it may be looked upon to be very fully made appear from *Harding* himſelf, that his Authority cannot be made uſe of to prove that *Jewell*

LeQuien's *Way of arguing from* Harding's *Queſtion.*

Jewell had in fact no Ordination. And this might be enough, without taking the farther Trouble to conſider what our Adverſaries argue, from any of his Words, to the contrary. But I ſhall give the Reader that Satisfaction, as far as it may be proper and neceſſary, and ſo am come to what *Le Quien* [g] argues from his Queſtions to *Jewell*. He claps cloſe to them, and ſets down firſt before them, that Citation, *Shew us the Letters of your Orders, &c.* tho' that Place follows them at the diſtance of more than three Pages in the *Detection*. I was at firſt at a Loſs for the Reaſon, till I obſerved that *Le Quien*, from theſe two Citations together, infers that Harding *demanded of* Jewell *to produce the Act of his Conſecration*; which I conceive he took to be the Senſe of his Words, *If your Vocation be ordinary, ſhew us the Letters of your Orders.* The *Father* introduces his Argument thus, after the Queſtions. Harding [h] *calls in queſtion* (he ſays) *a Fact which ought to have been publick and notorious, according to the Regiſter. He ſummons* Jewell *to produce the Act of his Conſecration, and to name the three Biſhops which ought to have laid Hands upon him. Le Quien*'s Grounds for the former muſt be his Words, as I ſaid, *Shew us the Letters of your Orders?* For the other, that he tells him, *Biſhops have always— according to the Canons, been conſecrated by three Biſhops.* Then *Le Quien* gives an exact and particular Account of *Jewell*'s Act of Conſecration in the Regiſter, "That ac- "cording to it *Jewell* was ſolemnly conſecrated, "*January* 21. *Ann.* $15\frac{59}{60}$. not only by three, but "by four Biſhops, by *Matthew Parker* Arch- "Biſhop of *Canterbury*, *Edmund Grindall* Biſhop "of *London*, *Richard Cox* Biſhop of *Ely*, and "*John Hodgskins* Biſhop (*Suffragan* he ſhould have ſaid) "of *Bedford*." Then he ſhews how *Hard-*

[g] T. 1. p. 292, 293. [h] P. 294.

ing

ing calls this Fact in queſtion. " *He denies*, he " ſays (*hautement*, that is) *openly*, *plainly*, *and* " *confidently*, *that* Jewell's *Conſecration was per-* " *formed by three Biſhops*; *and demands*, *By what* " *Rite? By what Ceremony? Who made him Prieſt?* " *Who made him Biſhop?*

By the *Father*'s ſetting forth the Fact from the Regiſter ſo punctually and formally, the Time, the Day and Year, when *Jewell* was conſecrated; the Manner how, *ſolemnly*, that is, with all the Solemnities in King *Edward*'s Ordinal; the Perſons by whom, their Number, four, both the Names of each of the four; their reſpective Titles of Arch-Biſhop and Biſhops, and the Names of their diſtinct Sees or Places of their Juriſdiction (by his being ſo particular in the Fact to be diſproved) the Reader may very well apprehend that *Harding*'s Words imply a Diſproof of the Truth of the Regiſter in Whole and Part, that is, in all the foregoing Particulars. But when he comes to *Le Quien*'s Argument, he finds how very far it falls ſhort of his Expectation. The Words *That* Jewell's *Conſecration was not performed by three Biſhops*, do not imply a Denial of his being conſecrated upon the Day and Year above-mentioned, nor of his being conſecrated with the ſuppoſed Solemnity, nor of the Conſecration being performed by any Perſon whatſoever, nor by three or four Perſons, nor by Perſons with the Names given by the Regiſter to each of the four, nor of thoſe Perſons being at leaſt of the Order of Preſbyters; nor, laſtly, of one or two of them being Biſhops: The Words do not in any wiſe imply a Denial of the Fact, in any one of theſe Particulars, but only of his having three Biſhops for his Conſecrators; ſo that if he were conſecrated either by two Biſhops, or by one, the Words will allow that he was validly conſecrated, (for that may be done by one Biſhop) but deny that he was conſe-

crated lawfully, that is, by Three, the canonical Number; and though the four Perſons were none of them Biſhops, but only Presbyters, the Words will ſtill allow that it was (though unlawful and invalid) a Conſecration in fact. If then his Words do not imply a Denial of the Fact in any thing more, to what Purpoſe are the Particulars ſet down with ſo much Formality, except it be to amuſe the Readers, and to lead them into a falſe Opinion that the whole Fact is entirely denied? But this is not a direct Fallacy impoſed upon us by *Le Quien*, but a Trap laid, for the haſty or credulous Reader to impoſe upon himſelf; the direct Cheat that he is willing to put upon us is to follow. The Argument is, That *Harding* denies (*hautement*) poſitively that *Jewell*'s Conſecration was performed by three Biſhops; conſequently he denies the Fact of his Conſecration, as it is related in the Regiſter, which ſays he was conſecrated not only by three but by four Biſhops. Upon what Ground does *Le Quien* tell us that *Harding* does deny this? Upon his Reaſon for the Queſtion Who conſecrated him, That *by the Canons of the Church Biſhops have been always conſecrated by three other Biſhops*. Here the Reader will find the Reaſon of my aſking, when I was before upon this Place[1], What three Biſhops the Canons require to be the Conſecrators of another Biſhop, whether they require three true Biſhops, or are ſatisfied with three other Perſons, provided they are called Biſhops, have the Name and Title of Biſhops, or are, in a word, reputed Biſhops? The Reader might then, as well as I, take it to be a ridiculous Queſtion; but he was told there would be Reaſon for it, when we come to find that either *Harding*, or *Le Quien* for him, puts ſuch a ridiculous Gloſs upon the Canons. The

His Argument that Harding's *denying that* Jewell *was conſecrated by three Biſhops muſt be a Diſproof of the Regiſter, becauſe it gives* Jewell's *Conſecrators the Title of Biſhops.*

[1] Sup. p. 360.

Act

Act of *Jewell*'s Conſecration in the Regiſter ſays that he was conſecrated by thoſe four Perſons, under their Names, and under the Titles, one of Arch-Biſhop, the other three of Biſhops. *Harding*, on the contrary, ſays he was not conſecrated by three Biſhops as the Canons of the Church require. If the Regiſter's giving them the Title of Biſhops, were the ſame thing as expreſly declaring that they had the Epiſcopal Order, and were real and true Biſhops; then *Harding*'s ſaying they were no true Biſhops would imply a Denial of the Truth of the Regiſter. But if ſuch a Title being given to any Perſon in the publick Acts does not imply that it is declared in the publick Acts that he has a Right to claim ſuch a Title; then the denying him to have that Right does not imply a Denial of the Truth of thoſe Acts. If it be pretended to be otherwiſe, let me aſk *Le Quien* whether he would allow us to take it for a good Proof from the Regiſter, that *Jewell*'s Conſecrators were true Biſhops, becauſe the Act of his Conſecration gives them that Title? or whether he would not expect it to be proved from other Evidences of their own having had true Conſecration? If the Regiſter's giving them the Title implied a Declaration that they were what the Title imports, then, if the Regiſter itſelf be of good Authority, it muſt be allowed to be a Proof of thoſe whom it ſtiles Biſhops really having the Epiſcopal Order. If *Harding* then be made to contradict the Regiſter in his objecting that *Jewell* had not three Biſhops as the Canons require, he muſt be ſuppoſed to put this Gloſs upon the Canons, That it would be enough to ſatisfy the Church's Obligation to obſerve them, to have a Biſhop ordained by three Perſons having the Name and Title of Biſhops, whether they were true Biſhops or not. So we ſee once more a Man of Learning and Judgment, impoſing upon us by

The Ridiculouſneſs of this Way of reaſoning.

an arrant Piece of Sophiſtry. The Regiſter ſays *Jewell* was conſecrated by *Parker* Arch-Biſhop of *Canterbury*, and *Grindal* Biſhop of *London*, *&c.* *Harding* denies the former to be a true Arch-Biſhop, and the other to be a true Biſhop; therefore he contradicts the Regiſter, and if what he ſays is true, what the Regiſter ſays is falſe. But might not *Harding* have ſaid in one and the ſame Breath, Arch-Biſhop *Parker* is no true Arch-Biſhop, and Biſhop *Grindall* is no true Biſhop? If he ſhould, in the firſt Words he would call them Biſhops, but in the laſt would deny them to be Biſhops. Would he then contradict himſelf? and muſt his firſt Words be falſe if his laſt were true? Hear him himſelf, in the very laſt Words cited by *Le Quien* before the Queſtion *Who called you, &c.* "Who could give that to you of all theſe "New Miniſters, howſoever elſe you call them, "which he hath not himſelf?" *Howſoever elſe you call them*; that is, tho' you call them, not by the Title of plain Miniſters, but by the Title of a higher Order, Biſhops or Arch-Biſhops. Is it not much the ſame as if he had ſaid, *Matthew Parker* your Metropolitan and Arch-Biſhop of *Canterbury*, and *Edmund Grindall* your Biſhop of *London*, or any others of your New Miniſters, cannot validly confer upon you (ſuppoſe they ſhould, or have laid Hands upon you) the Order, which they have not themſelves. Would he not here grant that they are called Biſhops, and yet deny them to be that which their Titles import, true Biſhops? and might he not uſe the Titles, if he pleaſed, himſelf, without his Conſcience giving him the Reproach of ſaying what he believes to be falſe? The Reaſon is, becauſe his uſing the Titles does not imply that he affirms they really are what the Titles import, but only that they are reputed ſo to be. Apply this to the Regiſter, and it ſhews how little the Falſhood of it can be concluded

from *Harding*'s ſaying they were not true Biſhops; how far it is from being a good Conſequence that the Regiſter which calls them Biſhops muſt be falſe for calling them ſo, tho' it does not in any wiſe declare that they were really and truly Biſhops.

Take the Argument, if you pleaſe, in another View. *Harding* denies the Fact in the Regiſter. The Regiſter ſays that *Jewell* had Hands laid upon him by four Perſons, *Matthew Parker* Arch-Biſhop of *Canterbury*, *Edmund Grindal* Biſhop of *London*, *Richard Cox* Biſhop of *Ely*, and *John Hodgskins* Suffragan of *Bedford*. *Harding* denies *Parker* to be a true Arch-Biſhop, and the other three to be true Biſhops; conſequently he denies the Fact, that theſe four Perſons performed *Jewell*'s Conſecration. Take away, if you pleaſe, theſe Titles of Arch-Biſhop of *Canterbury*, Biſhop of *London*, *&c.* and then we ſhall ſee what will become of the Fact. It will ſtand thus, That *Jewell*'s Conſecration was performed by theſe four Perſons, *Matthew Parker*, *Edmund Grindal*, *Richard Cox*, and *John Hodgskins*. Is not this enough for the Fact, as far as it relates to the Perſons, and for us to ſay of each of them *Conſtat de Perſonâ?* It is not enough for the Conſecration to be valid; nor are the bare Titles of Biſhops enough for that, except they were really what the Titles import; but *Le Quien* does not pretend to diſpute about the Validity, but about the Fact (as he muſt, to ſhew the Regiſter to be falſe) of *Jewell*'s Conſecration.

But this Argument does deſerve to be a little more conſidered, becauſe it is ſo fruitful of Conſequences very extraordinary and of great Importance. To name one in particular: We and they both of us argue in *Bonner*'s Caſe from the Authority of *Dyer*'s *Reports*, in the Caſe between *Horne* and *Bonner*. But by this Way of arguing

it will appear that the Fact there is falſly related. The Lord Chief Juſtice, in the *Report*, calls *Horne* Biſhop of *Wincheſter*, and *Bonner* no more than *late* Biſhop of *London*. But if we allow that to be true which *Bonner*, *Stapleton* and *Harding* teſtify, That *Horne* was no true conſecrated Biſhop, nor Biſhop of *Wincheſter*, and that *Bonner* was (not the *late*, but) the *preſent* only true Biſhop of *London* at that very time; it follows that the Fact muſt be falſe, as it is related in the *Reports*, becauſe the Title of Biſhop is falſly given to *Horne*, and denied to *Bonner*, for the ſame Reaſon by which the Fact is proved to be falſly related in the Act of *Jewell*'s Conſecration.

But the Force of the Argument extends it ſelf to a much greater Compaſs. It does at one Blow deſtroy the Credit of all our publick Acts in Church or State, from the Beginning of the Reign of Queen *Elizabeth* to this time, wherein are related any Tranſactions in which our poor *Reputed* Biſhops have been concerned, or at which they are related to have been preſent, be they either in the Church Regiſters, or the Council Books, or the Journals of the Houſe of Peers, or elſewhere. The Perſons whom they relate to have been preſent at theſe Tranſactions are ſpecified under the Titles which they bore at that time when the Facts were done, and conſequently a great many of them very often under the Title of Arch-Biſhops and Biſhops. But a Catholick Diſputant will think himſelf very able to prove, that we have not had one true Arch-Biſhop or Biſhop ſince *Matthew Parker*'s time; and then he may go on with *Le Quien*, and infer that all theſe publick Acts, that give *Matthew Parker* and thoſe that came after him the Title of Biſhops, are either forged, or at leaſt falſe in Matter of Fact. See the Fruits of the Subtilty and *Fineſſe* of *Le Quien*'s Way of arguing; and by how many Ways, more than

we thought of, the Truth of our Records may be diſproved! But then it may be ſaid, there is the more Reaſon to give a clear Anſwer to ſuch an Argument. There needs nothing more than an eaſy Diſtinction. Theſe publick Acts mention the Perſons under theſe Titles; but their giving them the Titles does not imply that they declare theſe Titles to belong to them of right, but that they are reputed to belong to them; ſo that tho' they ſhould not belong to them of right, the publick Acts are not falſe in ſaying that which implies that thoſe Titles were reputed to belong to them; much leſs are they falſe in relating that thoſe Perſons were preſent when the Facts were done, or that they bore the Part which they are ſaid to have borne in theſe Tranſactions. So I hope there is a ſatisfactory Anſwer given to this ſurprizing and extraordinary Way of reaſoning, and it muſt be left to the Reader, to paſs his Cenſure either upon the Judgment or Sincerity of the Reaſoner, as he finds good Grounds for it.

The other Demands that he mentions of *Harding*'s, *By what Rite? By what Ceremony? Who made him Prieſt? Who made him Biſhop?* I have ſufficiently proved already ought not neceſſarily to be underſtood to imply any thing more than that if *Jewell* would give the true Anſwer to theſe Queſtions, it would appear that the Rite and Ceremony by which he was conſecrated was unlawful, and that from the Perſons who, as he muſt own, laid Hands upon him when he was made Prieſt or Biſhop, he could not have a lawful or a valid Ordination. So that theſe Queſtions do not imply that he was not *in fact* conſecrated by that Rite and Ceremony, nor by thoſe Perſons, but that he was not *validly* and *lawfully* conſecrated by that Rite and by thoſe Perſons.

7. And

The Remarker's *Way of arguing from* Harding's *Queſtions to* Jewell.

7. And ſo, whatever Expectation F. *Le Quien* may have raiſed in us, that it would be proved from the Queſtions that *Harding* puts to *Jewell*, if the Import of them were well conſidered, that he denies that *Jewell* ever had in fact any Conſecration, or that Conſecration which he is reported to have in the *Lambeth* Regiſter, and that it follows from his Denial of the Fact, that the Act of *Jewell*'s Conſecration in the Regiſter muſt be falſe: We ſee here notwithſtanding, when the *Father* comes to lay theſe Queſtions before his Reader, how unable he is to make out from them what he pretends, without impoſing upon us by the moſt palpable Sophiſtry inſtead of true Reaſoning. We are next to ſee whether the *Remarker*'s Way of arguing upon theſe Queſtions is more rational. He is willing to obſerve, as of ſome Weight, That the Author when he prints theſe Queſtions has this marginal Note againſt them, [k] *Hard Queſtions proponed to Mr.* Jewell; and that he has the like Note againſt another Place, *The Defenders have nothing to ſay for Defence of their Vocation.* I may add, That in the very Text, after his Queſtions, he concludes thus [l], *Hitherto neither you nor your Fellows— can make any juſt or right Anſwer, I am ſure.* And here, I preſume, it might have very much convinced and ſatisfied the Reader beforehand, to have ſeen in the Margin, "The Author is ſure that no Pro-"teſtant Biſhop can anſwer theſe Queſtions." Such Notes, the *Remarker* might have eaſily ſeen, are a Proof of *Harding*'s great Confidence, but not in the leaſt that his Queſtions are unanſwerable; but rather the contrary, that there is nothing of Reality where there is ſo much of Shew and Oſtentation. But let us ſee if he can do his Au-

[k] Remarks, p. 61. [l] Detect. fol. 195. b.

thor

thor that Service as to ſhew they are unanſwerable, and that by theſe Objections of that *Controvertiſt* he can prove the Regiſter to be *incredible.*

Harding's Queſtions about *Jewell*'s *Vocation*, if we obſerve the Beginning of them, as they are cited in the *Remarker* [m], are thus addreſſed; *How ſay you, Sir, you bear yourſelf as though you were Biſhop of* Salisbury. But when he comes to conſider them they appear to have another reading, *Sir, you bear yourſelf as if you were* Matthew Parker, *Arch-Biſhop of* Canterbury. For he proceeds directly to a kind of Proof from them againſt the Fact of *Parker*'s [n] Conſecration, that he was not conſecrated by *Barlow*. *Le Quien* argues from theſe Queſtions to *Jewell*, that *Jewell* was not in fact conſecrated by *Parker*, *Grindall*, *Cox*, and *Hodgskins*; the *Remarker*, from the ſame Queſtions to the ſame Perſon, argues that *Parker* was not in fact conſecrated by *Barlow*, *Scory*, *Coverdale*, and *Hodgskins*. Why he makes theſe two Facts the ſame, and the ſuppoſed Denial of the one to be the Denial of the other, he gives us no Reaſon. But granting that *Harding* directs theſe Queſtions to *Parker* alſo, under *Jewell*'s Name, what is it then that the *Remarker* proves? He proves from *Harding*'s defying *Parker* to name *Who laid Hands upon him*, that Harding *knew either that* Barlow *was no true Biſhop, or that he did not lay Hands upon* Parker. What muſt be the Ground of this? *Harding*'s Queſtion implying a Denial that *Parker* had Hands laid upon him by any Perſon, or a Denial that he had Hands laid upon him by any Biſhop? If it imply that he had Hands laid upon him by no Perſon, then the *Remarker*'s Inference ſhould be, that he knew either that there was no ſuch Perſon as *Barlow*, or that that Perſon did not lay his Hands upon *Parker*; if it imply

His Attempt to prove that Barlow *was not* Parker's *Conſecrator by a* Disjunctive, *That either he was not his Conſecrator, or he was not a True Biſhop.*

[m] P. 58. [n] P. 59.

that

that he had Hands laid upon him by no Biſhop, then his Inference is right, That *Barlow either was no true Biſhop, or that Biſhop* Barlow *did not lay Hands upon* Parker. Can we deſire from the *Remarker* a better Proof, againſt himſelf, that the Meaning of *Harding*'s Queſtion, *Who laid Hands upon you?* is not, What Perſon laid Hands upon you? ſo as to imply a Denial of his having Impoſition of Hands from any Perſon; but, What Biſhop laid Hands upon you? ſo as to imply a Denial of his having the Impoſition of any Biſhops Hands.

I need not conſider his *disjunctive* Propoſition any farther; it is the ſame that he gives us before[o], (only there it is *Barlow* and *Hodgskins*, here it is *Barlow* alone) as a Conſequence of *Harding*'s affirming that the Proteſtants *had no Conſecrated Biſhops of their Sect*, where, as the Author ſpeaks in general that the Proteſtants had no Biſhops to give the Order to any others, there was good Reaſon to apply it to *Parker*'s Conſecration in particular, as well as to *Jewell*'s. I have already ſufficiently anſwered what he ſays in that Place, and therefore need here only to ſhew the Reader his Way of reaſoning, in a Word or two. His Concluſion from *Harding*'s defying *Parker* to name his Conſecrators ought to be, That *Barlow* poſitively was not his Conſecrator; but it is, That either *Barlow* was not his Conſecrator, or *Barlow* was not a true Biſhop. It is juſt the ſame as if I were to prove that the Author of the *Remarks upon F.* Le Courayer is poſitively ſuch a Perſon; and my Concluſion, inſtead of that, ſhould be, That either he is ſuch a Perſon, or ſome Body elſe. So he is to prove it to be true that *Barlow* was not *Parker*'s Conſecrator; but his Proof is, Either that is true, or ſomething elſe. One would

[o] Sup. p. 342.

think

think that he might have ſeen enough, when he firſt offered at this Sort of Reaſoning, not to have been forward to uſe it more than once: but it ſeems he is ſo well pleaſed with it, being new, and his own, that we never fail to meet with it again as often as he has an Opportunity. It is the ſame Argument that he brings in the next Page but one, from *Harding*'s ſaying in the Margin, *Hard Queſtions* proponed *to* Jewell; and again, *The Defenders have nothing to ſay for Defence of their Vocation.* This *Defence*, and theſe *Queſtions*, he ſays, [p] *would be very eaſy, if it was notorious that they* (our Biſhops) *were conſecrated by* Barlow, *and that* Barlow *was a true Biſhop.* Here (waving his ſtrange Way of expreſſing himſelf, as if he underſtood that the *Lambeth* Regiſter makes *Barlow* to be the Conſecrator, not of Arch-Biſhop *Parker* only, but of *Jewell* and *Horne*, and the reſt of the Proteſtant Biſhops) the Inference that he appears to make is, That their being *hard Queſtions*, and a difficult *Defence*, (in *Harding*'s Opinion) implies that either *Harding* meant that they were not conſecrated by *Barlow*, or that *Barlow* was no true Biſhop. He is at the ſame Way of arguing again, from *Harding*'s Words, where he does really ſpeak of *Parker*'s Conſecration only; the Words are, *How, I pray you, was your Arch-Biſhop himſelf conſecrated? What three Biſhops in the Realm were there to lay Hands upon him?* —— *There were ancient Biſhops in* England *who either were not required or refuſed to conſecrate you.* Here [q] *again* Harding, he ſays, *plainly means either That* Barlow *was not then in the Realm, or at leaſt not the Conſecrator of* Parker, *or no Biſhop.* To keep to his Author, his Disjunction ought to be, Either *Barlow* was out of the Realm, or was not *required* to conſecrate *Parker*, or *refuſed*, or was no *An-*

[p] P. 61. [q] P. 63.

cient

cient Biſhop. This Disjunctive is a Conſequence of what *Harding* ſays, but the *Remarker* for no Ancient Biſhop, puts no Biſhop; and he could not tell how to mumble thoſe Thiſtles, that *Barlow* was either *not required, or refuſed* to conſecrate *Parker*, it being ſo notorious that he was twice required to confirm and conſecrate that Arch-Biſhop by the Queen's *Mandates*, and as unqueſtionable that being a Proteſtant, and himſelf upon his Preferment, he could not refuſe to do that which he thought to be lawful and his Duty, as well as for his Intereſt, to pay an Obedience to the Queen's *Mandates*. However, this Writer is willing we ſhould take it to be *Harding*'s Meaning that, *at leaſt he was not* Parker's *Conſecrator*, tho' the Words give him no Authority for it, except *Barlow* was either *not required* to conſecrate him, or when he was required *refuſed* it. But let his Disjunction be as he pleaſes, it appears how far we are like to be from being inlightned or convinced by this Way of arguing. We affirm that *Barlow* was both a true Biſhop, and *Parker*'s Conſecrator. He would be glad to diſprove both from *Harding*'s Teſtimony; but finding that impracticable, he attempts to ſhew that his Author denies one of the two. We expect to know from him whether of the two it is that the Author denies: He tells us, Either he denies that he was a true Biſhop, or that he laid Hands upon *Parker*; that is, he cannot aſſure us, that he denies *Barlow*'s being a true Biſhop, nor that he denies his being *Parker*'s Conſecrator; but that if he does not deny the one, he muſt mean to deny the other; *farther this* Remarker *ſays not*. So we are juſt where we were, and cannot poſitively be informed what was really *Harding*'s Meaning, except (as we ſaid before in *Neale*'s Caſe) a Way could be found to call up *Harding* from the Dead, and deſire him to explain himſelf; and then probably he

he would tell him that he meant no more but that *Barlow* was a Biſhop of the Old Conſecration, but an Apoſtate from their Church, and therefore *Parker*'s Conſecration by him was unlawful, tho' he did in fact conſecrate *Parker*, and was himſelf conſecrated before in their Church.

His Argument that Barlow *was not* Parker's *Conſecrator, from* Harding's *objecting that all the Ordination that* Parker, &c. *could pretend to, was from the New Miniſters.*

8. However, let us think what we will of this new Way of arguing, it is to him an evident Proof that *Barlow* did not conſecrate *Parker*. It appears from his Way of expreſſing himſelf when he is arguing from another Citation of *Harding*, where that Author tells *Jewell*, "Orders and "Conſecration you have not. For who could "give that to you of all theſe New Miniſters, or "howſoever elſe you call them, which he has not "himſelf?" [r] *Here again* (ſays the *Remarker*) *it is ſtill more evident that* Barlow *was not the Ordainer of* Parker. *Still more evident*; then it was made evident before: But we have ſeen in what manner; his Proof was, that *Barlow* poſitively was not the Conſecrator of *Parker*, becauſe he either was not his Conſecrator, or, if he was his Conſecrator, he was no Biſhop; in this Way he had made it evident before. But it may perhaps be made more evident now: And indeed this Argument, if it be concluſive, and relate to *Parker*, is a direct and poſitive Proof that *Parker* was not conſecrated by *Barlow*.

Let us ſee then how he argues. *Harding*, he ſays, *manifeſtly objects that all the Ordination they can pretend to was from the New Miniſters*; that is, as he underſtands it, from the *New Biſhops* made in the Beginning of Queen *Elizabeth*'s Reign. All the Ordination *They*, that is, all Queen *Elizabeth*'s firſt Biſhops can pretend to. One would think he intended by this Argument

[r] P. 60.

to

to prove that *Harding* denies the Fact of the Ordination of all the other Biſhops as well as *Parker*; but he makes uſe of it againſt *Parker*'s Conſecration only. And with good Reaſon, becauſe all the other Biſhops, except the firſt four whom *Parker* conſecrated, had none but him and other new Biſhops made by him, for their Conſecrators, (only *Hodgskins* the Suffragan was aſſiſtant to him and *Grindal* and *Cox*, in the Conſecration of *Young* and *Jewell*, and three others conſecrated with them) and it would have been a ſtrange way of arguing to diſprove their being in fact conſecrated by the new Biſhops, from *Harding*'s ſaying (as he underſtands him) that they could not pretend to any other Ordination but from the new Biſhops. As to *Parker*, he might have urged againſt the Account of his Conſecration in the Regiſter that not *Barlow* only, but alſo *Hodgskins*, *Scory*, and *Coverdale*, could not be his Conſecrators, for none of theſe three were Biſhops then newly made.

But to conſider the Force of his Argument to prove that *Parker* was not conſecrated by *Barlow*. It lies in this, that *Barlow* was not one of the *New Miniſters*. *Harding* ſays *Parker* had no Ordination but from the New Miniſters, conſequently he had none from *Barlow*, *who* (as the *Remarker* ſays) *if he was any Biſhop, was not at leaſt one of the* New Biſhops. 'Tis plain he underſtands by the New Miniſters, thoſe Biſhops that were newly made, not before Queen *Elizabeth*'s Reign. But can he aſſure us that his Author had that Meaning? Might he not mean ſome others taking upon themſelves to be Biſhops (before that time) of that which he calls the *New Church*, or Religion? *Harding* [s] did very well remember that there were ſome Perſons in King *Edward*'s Reign that *took upon them to give Holy Orders, tho' they were them-*

[s] Sup. p. 366.

ſelves

ſelves (as he ſays) *altogether out of Order, and had forſaken the whole Succeſſion of Biſhops in* Chriſtendome, *and erected a New Congregation of their own planting.* Himſelf owns that he had taken Deacon's Orders from one or ſome of them: And we know beſides that he was in that Reign a [t] *zealous Preacher* for the Reformation juſt before the Death of that King. But if he had been on the other Side, and writ in that King's time againſt the Reformers, would he not have called the Proteſtant Biſhops the *New Miniſters* of this *New Congregation?* Thoſe Biſhops were *Cranmer, Barlow, Farrar, Ridley, Poynet, Hooper, Scory, Coverdale, &c.* And what became of theſe Men, after it pleaſed God to deprive us of that Excellent Young Prince, under whoſe Protection they had erected their *New* Reformed *Church* or *Congregation?* Were they all, as well as *Cranmer, Ferrar, Ridley,* and *Hooper,* brought to the Stake in Queen *Mary*'s Reign? Or did ſome of them eſcape the Fury of that bloody Perſecution? And was not *Barlow* one of thoſe, who with ſome others, Biſhops as well as Prieſts of the Reformed Church of *England,* fled from that Perſecution, and took Sanctuary in other Countries? where they continued till that Tyranny of the Popiſh Prelates was overpaſt, and a Gracious Providence opened a Way for their Return? We are as forward as they can be to ſay that *Barlow* ought in Duty rather to have accompanied thoſe that died at the Stake, than to have ſaved himſelf by diſſembling and denying his Profeſſion, which the Fear of Death made him diſown till he could find a Way to eſcape that fiery Trial: But however, he (tho' by a Way ſo diſhonourable) was one of them that lived to ſee better Times. And then, upon the Acceſſion of a Proteſtant Princeſs to the Throne,

[t] Burnet's Hiſt. of Reform. Part 2. p. 272.

Sanders [v] himſelf tells us that the *Engliſh* Exiles returned from Abroad in the greateſt Haſte; and we know from better Authority, 'That *Scory* and *Barlow* came over early in the Year 1559. about the End of which Year *Parker* was conſecrated; 'That [w] *Scory* bore a Part in the Conference, *March* 31. and *April* 1.; and [x] *Barlow* preached at St. *Paul*'s Croſs before the End of *April*; and *Scory* in the ſame Place about the Middle of *Auguſt*; and *Coverdale* about the Middle of *November* following; 'That [y] *Barlow* and *Scory* both joined with *Parker* the 8th and 9th of *September* in performing the Ceremony of the Obſequies of the *French* King; 'That [z] by a Mandate from the Queen, dated that ninth of *September*, they, with ſome of the Popiſh Biſhops, and *Landaff*, were required to confirm and conſecrate *Parker*; and by a ſecond Mandate, *Dec.* 6. directed to *Landaff* and them two, and four others, were required to do it, and in Obedience to that Mandate, *Barlow*, *Scory*, *Coverdale*, and *Hodgskins* firſt confirmed *Parker*'s Election to the See of *Canterbury*, and then laid their Hands upon him to conſecrate him Arch-Biſhop.

If the *Remarker* can make it appear that *Harding* knew of no ſuch Miniſters of the New Reformed Church of *England* in King *Edward*'s time as *Barlow*, *Scory*, *Coverdale*, and *Hodgskins*, or that he knew they utterly diſappeared in Queen *Mary*'s Reign, ſo as never to ſhew their Heads again under Queen *Elizabeth*, or that they could not take upon them in her Reign to ordain Biſhops, Prieſts, and Deacons, as they had before in King *Edward*'s; if he can ſhew all this, then he may have ſome Ground to ſay that *Harding*, by the *New Miniſters*, could not mean *Barlow*, *&c.*

[v] Sup. p. 2. [w] Strype's Annals of Q. Eliz. Vol. 1. p. 89. [x] Id. p. 135, 136. [y] Id. p. 128. [z] Id. Life of Mat. Parker, p. 54, &c.

but

but only *Parker* himſelf, and the reſt of the Biſhops that were made after Queen *Elizabeth*'s Acceſſion to the Throne: But if he cannot, then he will have no Reaſon to be confident of the Strength of this New Argument.

This Argument would be a Proof that Parker *and our firſt Biſhops were ordained by none but by themſelves, according to the* Nag's-Head *Story.*

But it is ſtrange that when he was ſo fortunate as to make this Diſcovery, he ſhould not ſee how to proſecute the Argument to the beſt Advantage. *Harding*, he ſays, manifeſtly declares that *Parker* and all our firſt Biſhops could pretend to no other Ordination but from the *New Miniſters*; that is, the Biſhops newly made. Theſe Biſhops were, *Parker* himſelf, and *Grindall*, *Cox*, *Sands*, *Jewell*, *Young*, *Horne*, *&c.* If *They*, that is, all the Perſons above-named, and others, could pretend to no Ordination but from the *New Biſhops*, then they could pretend to no Ordination but from *themſelves*, conſequently they muſt have laid Hands upon one another. Did he not ſee that this is a plain Evidence from *Harding*, that *Parker* and the reſt had no other Conſecration, but ſuch an one as ſtands upon Record in the Story of the *Nag's-Head* Tavern? That theſe New Miniſters met together, and one or more of them laid Hands upon the reſt of the Company, and then one or more of thoſe that were firſt ordained laid their Hands upon their Conſecrators? So it muſt have been, if the New Biſhops could pretend to no Ordination but from the *New Biſhops*; that is, from themſelves: They could not then pretend to be conſecrated, but by one another. Is not this the *Nag's-Head* Ordination, bating only the Name of the Place, and of *Scory*, that firſt conſecrated the others, and then was himſelf conſecrated by one or more of them, and of what paſſed relating to *Landaff*? The *Remarker* might have ſpared himſelf the Trouble of uſing any other Arguments; this one alone, that *Harding* ſays they could have no Ordination but from the *New Miniſters*, is

enough, both to deſtroy the Credit of the *Lambeth* Ordination, and to ſet up inſtead of it that of the *Tavern*.

Harding's Inſtances of other Caſes, which he makes parallel to Jewell's, *ſhew that he had no Deſign to deny the Fact of his Ordination.*

9. *Harding* gives us a farther Proof that he had no thought of calling in queſtion the Fact of *Jewell*'s Ordination, from the Inſtances which he produces (in the [a] next and following Pages after his Queſtions about his Vocation) from *Athanaſius*, *Epiphanius*, *Hierome*, and *Cyprian*, of Perſons whoſe Caſes he makes parallel to *Jewell*'s, in the want of true Orders. Theſe Caſes, ſuppoſing him to deny that *Jewell* had in fact any Ordination or Impoſition of Hands at all, ought to be of Perſons who had not only no valid Ordination, but none in fact, as he is pretended to affirm of *Jewell*. But the contrary plainly appears in the firſt Inſtance, of *Iſchyras*'s Caſe, mentioned already [b]; whom *Harding* owns to have had Impoſition of Hands from *Colluthus*, but that his Ordination was judged to be invalid by *Athanaſius* and other Biſhops, becauſe *Colluthus* was himſelf no more than a Prieſt. *Harding* asks *Jewell*, *Why may not all good Catholicks judge the ſame* of him, as *Athanaſius* did of *Iſchyras?* What does he mean they may judge of him? that he had no Impoſition of Hands *at all*, from any Perſons? or that the Perſons who laid Hands upon him were themſelves, as *Colluthus* was, no more than Presbyters, and conſequently could not give him a *valid* Ordination? The latter, 'tis plain, is *Harding*'s Judgment, as well as *Athanaſius*'s, of *Iſchyras*'s Caſe; and therefore, by his own Confeſſion, he cannot be ſuppoſed to judge otherwiſe of *Jewell*.

His Meaning, in the next Inſtances, from *Epiphanius*, we learn by his Application of them in his own Words. After obſerving what that *Father*

[a] Detect. fol. 195. b. 196, 197. [b] Sup. p. 357.

ſays

ſays of *Zacchæus*, who *being but a Layman took upon him the Office of a Prieſt*; and of two others, who took upon them the *Office of Biſhops, without having received the Impoſition of Hands that pertaineth to the Conſecration of a Biſhop:* The Cenſure that he paſſes upon ſuch as *Jewell*, follows in theſe Words, "Thus they be neither Prieſts nor Dea-"cons (Biſhops he ſhould have ſaid in the firſt place) "which be not conſecrated lawfully ac-"cording to the Order uſed in the Church; that "is to wit, by *Biſhops* lawfully conſecrated, but "either by the *People*, or the *Lay-Magiſtrate*, as "it is in *ſome Places* where this Doctrine is "profeſſed, or by *Monks and Friars* Apoſtates, "or by excommunicate *Prieſts*, having no *Bi-"ſhoply* Power." Paſſing by the Expreſſion, of the Proteſtant Clergy being *conſecrated* by the People or the Lay-Magiſtrate, inſtead of his ſaying, their Call to their Functions was by the Election of the People, or the Lay-Magiſtrate's Appointment; we may obſerve, firſt, that his Ground of rejecting their Orders is becauſe they were not *conſecrated by Biſhops lawfully conſecrated.* Secondly, that he ſpeaks of two different Ways whereby they received a Call to their Functions; the one from the *People*, or the *Lay-Magiſtrate*; the other, from *Apoſtate Monks and Friars*, or *excommunicated Prieſts* that never had any higher Order. Thirdly, that he ſpeaks of their being made by the People and the Lay-Magiſtrate, as the Practice in *ſome Places*, or Countries, *where the* Proteſtant Doctrine *is profeſſed*; which Expreſſion, as he is ſpeaking to *Jewell*, he could not uſe, if he meant that this was the Practice in *England*; but muſt have ſaid, As it is *with you*, and in *other Places* where your Doctrine is profeſſed. The Places he means therefore muſt be *France*, *Switzerland*, and *Germany*, wherein the Proteſtants, he might ſuppoſe, had no other Call to the Mini-

ſtry; but the Practice in *England* he meant to be, for the Clergy not to be made by the ſole Act of the People's Election, or the Lay-Magiſtrate's Appointment, but by the Act of Eccleſiaſtical Perſons of the Regular or Secular Clergy (who had been once in the Communion of their Church) taking upon them to ordain our Biſhops and Clergy; which Perſons he deſcribes by *Monks and Friars Apoſtates, and excommunicate Prieſts not having Biſhoply Power.* By this it is clear that he owns the Fact of ſome ſuch Perſons laying Hands on *Parker*, and *Jewell*, *&c.* as he deſcribes, but denies only the Validity of ſuch Impoſition of Hands as theirs, for want of being themſelves Biſhops truly and lawfully conſecrated.

Harding[c] produces two Inſtances more; one from St. *Jerome*, of *Hilary* the Deacon; the other from St. *Cyprian*, of *Novatian*. Of *Hilary*, becauſe he never had any higher Order than that of Deacon, St. *Jerome* ſays, that having no *Power*, by his Order, *to conſecrate any Clerk that ſhould remain after him, he being dead, with the* Man *the Sect was ended.* This *Harding* applies to the Proteſtant Church of *England*, which he ſays muſt be at an End at the Deceaſe of their *Apoſtates* who came over from them to us; and he is in the right, if it be granted him, that there were no Members of our Church at that time, whether they had or had not been of their Communion, of an higher Order than Deacons or Prieſts. But it may be asked, what became of that one or more Apoſtate Biſhop or Biſhops, from whom he confeſſes himſelf to have received the Order of Deacon in King *Edward*'s Reign? Does *Harding* tell us that there was no ſuch Perſon or Perſons, from whom himſelf or others were ordained in that Reign, that were in being and in *England* after

[c] Sup. p. 365, 366.

Queen *Mary*'s Deceaſe, and Queen *Elizabeth*'s Acceſſion to the Throne? Does not our own Hiſtory[d] give us a certain Account of many more than were ſufficient by the Canons to conſecrate a Biſhop, that appeared publickly at that time? Might not ſome of theſe Perſons *in fact* lay Hands upon others, to continue the Succeſſion of Biſhops and the inferior Clergy? And does not *Harding* own in a manner, that it was in fact done by ſome [e] *Monks and Friars Apoſtates and excommunicate Prieſts* (as he calls them) *having no Biſhoply Power?* 'Tis true, what was done by them muſt be invalid and of no effect, if they had not Epiſcopal Authority; but its not being valid in *Harding*'s Opinion, is no Proof that he denies it was done in fact; and we deſire no better Proof of the *Validity* than that thoſe Perſons were as truly Biſhops then as they had been in King *Edward*'s time.

But there cannot be a plainer Demonſtration that *Harding* had no Thought of objecting againſt the *Fact* of his Adverſary's Ordination, than his laſt Inſtance of *Novatian.* Could this be brought as a parallel Caſe of one that never had *in fact* Hands laid upon him to make him Biſhop? *Novatian*[f], 'tis plain, had not only the Hands of three Perſons laid upon him, but of three true and lawful Biſhops; tho' 'tis true he had prevailed upon thoſe Biſhops to give him an unlawful and ſchiſmatical Ordination, and by vertue of that Ordination pretended to intrude himſelf into a See already full. 'Tis for this that St. *Cyprian* ſays (as *Harding* cites him) that *Novatian* was *ordained Biſhop of himſelf*; and not becauſe he had no Impoſition of Hands at all. 'Tis for this that the *Father* makes all *Novatian*'s Acts, of Baptizing, and adminiſtring the Euchariſt, mere Nullities; wherein ſo great a Scholar and Divine as Dr. *Harding* might

[d] Sup. p. 345. [e] Sup. p. 389, 390. [f] Sup. p. 279.

eaſily have known that St. *Cyprian* was under a Miſtake, and that his Opinion was rejected not long after by ſo great an Authority as that of the firſt General Council, who declared that the Adminiſtrations of the *Cathari* or *Novatians* were valid, their Baptiſms true Baptiſms, and the like of their Conſecrations of the Euchariſt, and Ordinations; and upon that Ground [g] ordered, that upon their Return to the Church they ſhould be admitted in the ſame Quality and Degree which they had in their own Sect, that is, ſhould be received as Biſhops, Prieſts, and Deacons, if they had thoſe Orders before from *Novatian* Biſhops. *Harding* bids *Jewell* apply to himſelf all that St. *Cyprian* ſays of that ſchiſmatical Biſhop; tho' he might have better declared all *Jewell*'s Acts to be null in the Exerciſe of his Function, (as he pretended that he had no Epiſcopal Conſecration) without making the Compariſon between him and a Biſhop that was conſecrated by three true and lawful Biſhops. But *Harding* deſired to make a Shew of running down his Adverſary with the Inſtances which he alledges from the *Fathers*, without conſidering in this laſt Inſtance, either that *Novatian*'s Caſe was by no means applicable to *Jewell*, or that St. *Cyprian* himſelf was miſtaken in his Judgment of *Novatian*'s Caſe.

Harding's Demand of his Adverſary to *ſhew his Letters of Orders*, has been taken notice of already [h]: But we are to take notice of what he ſays in the Cloſe of his Objections [i], "Though the "Prince has promoted you, you are Preſumers "and Intruders of yourſelves: Lands and Man- "nors the Prince may give you; Prieſthood and "Biſhophood the Prince cannot give you." This the *Remarker* [k] tells us the Author ſays, *to ſhew*

[g] Concil. Nic. 1. Can. 8.
[h] Sup, p. 362, 363, 364.
[i] Detection, f. 197. b.
[k] P. 61.

from

from whence all their pretended Orders flowed. And the like Conſequence he draws before, from his Words elſewhere, " A Biſhop you are not, I am " right ſure, neither can all the Kings and Queens " in the World, nor all the Parliaments of *Eng-* " *land*, by their own only Power and Authority, " make you a Lawful and True Biſhop." *Theſe Words*, [l] he ſays, *plainly ſignify that* Harding *knew of no other Pretence they could lay to Epiſcopacy but by the Queen's and Parliament's own only Power.* *Le Quien* [m] makes the ſame uſe of both theſe Places, to ſhew that the Author *defies* Jewell *to prove that he was made Biſhop otherwiſe than by the Queen's Letters Patents.* But could not both theſe Writers ſee that *Harding* might ſay what he does in theſe Words, and yet own (as I have ſhewed [n] he does own) that the Clergy in *England* were not made (as the Practice was in *ſome Places* where the Proteſtant Doctrine was profeſſed) by the *Lay Magiſtrate*'s Power only, but that ſome other Perſons, *Monks and Friars Apoſtates* (as he calls them) *or excommunicate Prieſts, not having Biſhoply Power*, acted a Part, diſtinct from the Part of the Lay Magiſtrate, in calling the Clergy to their reſpective Orders and Functions? If he appears to own this, how can it be ſaid that he declares, That in fact *all their Orders flowed from the* Prince, That *they had no other Pretence to Epiſcopacy but by the* Queen's and Parliament's *own only Power*, and That *they were not Biſhops otherwiſe than by the Queen's* Letters Patents? His very Words, that neither the Queen or Parliament could make *Jewell* a Biſhop by their *own only Power*, ſhew that he meant there wanted the Concurrence of ſome other, the *Spiritual Power*, that is, as he expreſſes it, of *lawful Biſhops lawfully conſecrated*, without which their Ordination could not be valid, tho' both the

[l] P. 56. [m] T. 1. p. 295. [n] Sup. p. 389, 390.

Queen

Queen by her Letters Patents, and alſo ſuch Perſons of the Clergy as he deſcribes, *having no Biſhoply Power*, attempted *in fact* to make him a Biſhop.

10. I hope I may now conclude, that it has been ſufficiently and clearly proved from *Harding* himſelf, that in his Objections againſt *Jewell*, he not only might not, but could not, have any Meaning to deny his having been in *fact* ordained or having received Impoſition of Hands for the Prieſthood, and the Epiſcopal Order, but only that he had not a valid and lawful Ordination. This I may conclude, [o] From the Author's declaring by *Le Quien*'s Confeſſion, the Nullity of the Ordination of *Parker* and our firſt Biſhops, becauſe they were ordained by Perſons who had not the Epiſcopal Order nor Character; [p] From his Demand of *Jewell*'s proving his Right and Authority to take upon him the Office of Biſhop; [q] From the Ground of his Queſtions to him about his Vocation, that we had no Conſecrated Biſhops; [r] From his Reaſon for his denying *Jewel*'s Ordination to the Prieſthood; [s] From his Reaſon for denying his Conſecration to the Epiſcopal Order; [t] From his Demands in the Introduction to his Queſtions; [v] From the Reaſon of his demanding a Sight of *Jewell*'s Letters of Orders; [w] From his Anſwer to the ſame Queſtions which he owns he put to himſelf about his receiving the Order of Deacon in King *Edward*'s time; and laſtly, [x] From the Inſtances he brings out of *Athanaſius*, and others of the *Fathers*, of Caſes which he alledges as parallel to *Jewell*'s Caſe.

[o] Sup. p. 336, 338, &c. [p] P. 346, 347. [q] P. 354. [r] P. 356. [s] P. 358, 359. [t] P. 360, 361. [v] P. 362, 363. [w] P. 364, 365, &c. [x] P. 388.

If it is thus clearly proved from the Author himſelf, that he had no thought of denying the Fact, but only the Lawfulneſs and Validity of the Ordination of *Jewell* and *Parker*, and the reſt of our firſt Biſhops; no thought of denying that they had any Impoſition of Hands at all, but only that they had the laying on of Hands of true Biſhops; muſt it not appear to be a very ſtrange ſort of Confidence, or Want of Judgment in F. *Le Quien*, to declare that the [y] *Eſſential and Capital Point of Controverſy between this Catholick Doctor and his Adverſary, was not to diſpute whether the Ordinations our Biſhops received were valid or invalid, but to diſpute their having been ordained at all in any manner whatſoever?* that he [z] *calls in queſtion their having had any Ordination whatſoever*, and *is the moſt plain, expreſs and punctual* (le plus net & le plus formel) *upon this Article?* Let the Reader ſee from hence how much either the *Father*'s Prejudices impoſe upon and blind his own Judgment, or how willing he is to impoſe upon his credulous Catholicks, by confidently pronouncing that of *Harding* which the Author's own Words plainly prove he never thought of.

[y] Sup. p. 248. [z] Sup. p. 336.

CHAP.

CHAP. X.

The Anſwer which our Adverſaries pretend Jewell *ought to have made to* Harding's *Objections againſt the Orders of our Biſhops.* Le Quien's *Attempt to prove that* Jewell's Act of Conſecration *was called for by* Harding. *The Attempt of the Author of the* Nullity of the Prelatick Clergy, &c. *to prove that* Harding *expreſly required of* Jewell *to* ſhew the Regiſter *of his Conſecration. That Author convicted of a plain Forgery, and Falſification of* Harding's *Words. The confident Uſe he makes of this Forgery throughout his Book. Juſt Reflections upon the Character of that Writer.* Harding's *Reaſon for demanding the* Letters of Orders *ſhews that he had no thought of objecting againſt the Fact, but the Validity of the Ordinations. Tho'* Jewell *had produced the Regiſter, it would not have been a ſatisfactory Anſwer to his Adverſary.* Le Quien's *Reflection upon* Jewell's *Anſwer to* Harding *as* ſhuffling *and* evaſive. *Proved that he gives him a proper and direct Anſwer, and that* Harding *makes a* ſhuffling *Reply, wherein he miſrepreſents and falſifies* Jewell's *Anſwer.* Le Quien's *interpreting* Jewell's *Words, That a Conſecration by* one Biſhop *is* valid, *as if he owned that he himſelf was conſecrated only by* Scory *at the Tavern. What* Harding *ſays upon this Occaſion ſhews he knew nothing of the* Nag's-Head *Ordination. His Pretence that* Jewell *had not yet* anſwered *his Queſtions,*

Queſtions, at the ſame time when in his Detection *he is ſetting down the* Anſwers *to them.* Jewell *not obliged to prove his Conſecrators to be true Biſhops, except* Harding *had offered ſome Arguments to prove the contrary.* Le Quien's *and* Fitzherbert's *Reflections upon* Jewell's *Words,* Our Biſhops are made in Form and Order, &c. *as if he meant* other *Biſhops, and not* himſelf. Harding's *Reply about the* Arch-Biſhop's *Conſecration. How little it is to the Purpoſe of proving, that he never had any Conſecration at all, or that he had none but at the* Nag's-Head. Jewell's *making no* Rejoinder *to it, of no Service to our Adverſaries.* Le Quien *furniſhes us with a good Reaſon why* Jewell *muſt think it impertinent to give* Harding *any Proof of the Fact of his Ordination. The* Father's *Pretence that* Harding, &c. conteſted the Fact *of the Ordination of our Biſhops, becauſe otherwiſe they muſt have been Fools or Madmen to reproach them as having never been truly conſecrated. The arguing of the Author of the* Nullity, *that we ought out of* Charity *to* Harding *and* Stapleton *to believe they were certain that there was no Conſecration at* Lambeth.

The Anſwer which our Adverſaries pretend Jewell *ought to have made to* Harding's *Objections againſt our Orders.*

1. IF *Harding*, as has been ſhewed, never offered to call in queſtion the Fact of the Ordination of *Jewell*, or the reſt of our firſt Biſhops, *Jewell* muſt ſee that he had no occaſion, for any thing that his Adverſary thought fit to object, to make Proof of that Fact to him which he never denied. Yet we find *Fitzherbert* and others in his time, and the Author of the *Treatiſe*

of Catholick Faith, &c. and of the *Nullity of our Prelatick Clergy*, after them, and *Le Quien* now, inſiſting upon *Jewell*'s Silence in this Particular, and his neglecting to produce ſuch Evidence of the Fact as they are pleaſed to expect, as a plain Confeſſion that himſelf and his Brethren had in fact either no Ordination whatſoever, or at leaſt no better than that at the Tavern. *Fitzherbert*'s Words to this Purpoſe we had before[a]; and I need not add any more than what we have from *Le Quien*; "[b] *Jewell*, he ſays, having been ſo "often ſummoned, by the late Treaſurer of his "Church of *Salisbury*, to prove his having the "Epiſcopal Order, at leaſt from his Letters of "Orders, how does he anſwer in his Defence "againſt *Harding?* Does he produce the Act of "his Conſecration? Does he refer *Harding* to the "Arch-Biſhop's *Regiſter?* Does he name the "Perſons who were his Conſecrators? Which if "done would have ſtopped his Adverſary's "Mouth." Two things the *Father* inſiſts upon in this Place. Firſt, That *Harding* had called for the Act of *Jewell*'s Conſecration. Secondly, That if ſuch Evidence had been produced, it would have been enough to ſilence *Harding*, and to put an End to the Diſpute. The firſt he attempts to prove from *Harding*'s Words, *Shew us the Letters of your Orders*; wherein he ſays, [c] Jewell *is challenged, preſſed, and defyed, to produce the Letters of his Conſecration, to ſhew any Regiſter where thoſe Letters are depoſited.* Let me aſk Who informed *Le Quien*, that our Biſhops uſe to have Letters Teſtimonial of their Conſecration from the Arch-Biſhop, and the Perſons aſſiſting him in the Ceremony, and that theſe Letters are depoſited with the Act of Conſecration in the Arch-Biſhop's Regiſter? That the whole Pro-

LeQuien's *Attempt to prove that* Harding *called for* Jewell's Act of Conſecration.

[a] Sup. p. 235. [b] T. 1. p. 296. [c] T. 1. p. 305.

ceeding

ceeding of a Biſhop's Conſecration is drawn up into an Act by Publick Notaries employed for that Purpoſe, and atteſted by them, and entered uſually into the publick Regiſter of the Arch-Biſhop, and there preſerved; this the *Father* might eaſily know to be the Practice in *England*. But he is to tell us, Who informed him that beſides (or inſtead of) this, the Biſhop Conſecrated has Letters from the Arch-Biſhop and the reſt of his Conſecrators, under their Hands and Seals, I preſume; and that theſe Letters are laid up in, or a Copy of them is entered into the Arch-Biſhop's Regiſter, to be kept there? His Informer was probably the ſame from whom he learnt a great deal more of the *Engliſh* Hiſtory, and our Forms of proceeding in Eccleſiaſtical and Civil Affairs, which enables him to give us for certain Matter of Fact, whatever he pleaſes of our Parliaments [d] and Convocations, Statutes of the Realm [e], and Articles of the Church, and [f] Proceedings of the Judges and Juries in *Weſtminſter* Hall, with as good Authority as he has here to tell us that *Harding* called for *Jewell*'s *Letters of his Conſecration* to the Epiſcopal Order *depoſited in the Arch-Biſhop's Regiſter*.

The Attempt of the Author of the Nullity of the Prelatick Clergy, &c. *to prove that* Harding *expreſly required of* Jewell *to ſhew his Conſecration from the Regiſter.*

2. However, *Le Quien* is much more modeſt than another *Writer*, who finds a Way to aſſure his Readers, that *Harding* in expreſs Terms called upon *Jewell* to ſhew him the *Regiſter* of his Conſecration. It is the Author of the *Nullity of the Prelatick Clergy*, for whom *Le Quien* has a great Reſpect, and gives him the Credit of having given a [g] ſolid Anſwer to Biſhop *Bramhall*'s *Conſecration of Proteſtant Biſhops vindicated*, from *Point to Point*. His Character we have Reaſon to know from

[d] P. 175, 176. [e] Sup. p. 304, 314. [f] Sup. p. 218.
[g] T. 1. Pref. p. lii.

from what appears of him before; but we ſhall be perfectly acquainted with it upon the Sight of his way of anſwering *Bramhall*, in the *firſt Point* which he takes in hand in the firſt and ſecond Page of that Treatiſe. The Biſhop, in Contradiction to what the Author had declared in a former Work, "[h] That our Biſhops were *often and* "*earneſtly urged*, and *hardly preſſed* by their Ad- "verſaries, the Catholick Doctors, to make due "and authentical Proof of their Calling, and yet "never produced the Regiſter," had ſaid, [i] *That there was no preſſing to produce Regiſters, nor any thing objected that deſerved the Production of a Regiſter.* The Author replies, "[k] That they were "preſſed immediately after, you may learn out "of Dr. *Harding*. We ſay likewiſe to you, Mr. "*Jewell*, and to each of your Companions. "Shew us the Regiſter of your Biſhops, *&c.* "Shew us the Letters of your Orders. But Or- "der you have not; for who could give that to "you, of all theſe new Miniſters, which he hath not himſelf?"

To ſee what Grounds he has from his Author, we are to look into *Harding*'s *Confutation*[l] *of* Jewell's *Apology*, and his Recital of that Part of it over again in his [m] *Detection of Errors, &c.* There he denies the Orders of him and the reſt of our Biſhops upon a double Account; firſt, their Want of Apoſtolick Succeſſion; ſecondly, their Want of true Vocation or Ordination. The firſt he charges them with, where he aſks *Jewell*, "[n] How "can you reckon us up your Succeſſion, by "which you may refer your Impoſition of Hands "and Conſecration to ſome of the Apoſtles or "their Scholars?" This may be underſtood of

[h] Treatiſe of Catholick Faith and Hereſy, p. 16, 21.
[i] Bramhall's Works, p. 484. [k] Nullity of the Prelatick Clergy, p. 2. [l] Jewell's Defenſe of the Apology, Ed. 1609. p. 119. [m] Fol. 194. [n] Ibid.

the

the perſonal Succeſſion of every Biſhop truly conſecrated, whereby he derives his Orders from the Apoſtles, by the Mediation of other true Biſhops from whom he receives his Conſecration, who had theirs from other Biſhops before them, and they in like manner in a Line backwards up to the Apoſtles times. But this Succeſſion is the ſame with a true Vocation or Conſecration; and tho' the Conſecration, with the Deſignation to a particular See, makes the Perſon Biſhop of that See, and Succeſſor to the Biſhops of that See before him, yet this, in *Harding*'s Opinion, is of no effect, without a Succeſſion in *Doctrine* (not to the Apoſtles only, but) to all the Biſhops that were his Predeceſſors in that See. And the Want of this he objects to *Jewell* in the next Queſtion that he puts to him. "[o] How many Biſhops can you "reckon whom in the Church of *Sarisbury* you "have ſucceeded as well in Doctrine, as in out-"ward ſitting in that Chair! Did any Biſhop in "that Chair before you teach that Doctrine?" This Objection he enforces[p], by alledging what *Tertullian* ſays againſt the Hereticks of his time, and St. *Auſtin* againſt the *Donatiſts*. *Tertullian*'s Words are, *Edant Origines Eccleſiarum ſuarum, Evolvant Ordines Epiſcoporum ſuorum, &c.* This *Harding* applies to his Adverſary and his Brethren, "We ſay likewiſe to you, Mr. *Jewell*—— and "to each of your *Companions*, Tell us the Ori-"ginal and firſt Spring of your Churches. Shew "us the *Regiſter of your Biſhops ſucceeding one an-"other from the beginning*, ſo as that the firſt have "ſome one of the Apoſtles, or of the Apoſto-"lick Men for his Author and Predeceſſor, *&c.*" He paſſes preſently from Succeſſion to Vocation, and after proſecuting that Argument, he puts a Queſtion to *Jewell*, at the diſtance of three or

[o] Ibid. [p] Detection, fol. 194. b.

four Pages in the *Detection* [q], " Tell us whether " your Vocation be ordinary or extraordinary. " If it be ordinary, ſhew us the Letters of your " Orders—— but Order and Conſecration you " have not, *&c.*

By this View of the Author himſelf we plainly ſee what Regiſter it is that he calls for from *Jewell*, or *Parker*, and the reſt of our Biſhops; a Regiſter or Roll of the Biſhops before them in their reſpective Sees, ſuch as he immediately refers to in [r] St. *Auſtin*, who ſets down the Names of thirty eight Biſhops of *Rome* from St. *Peter* to *Anaſtaſius*, the Biſhop of that See in his time. And yet it is this which the Writer of the *Nullity* gives us for a Proof of *Harding*'s demanding of our Biſhops to produce the *Regiſter* of the *Acts* of their ſeveral *Conſecrations*, to ſhew who were their Conſecrators, and by what Form and Manner they were conſecrated. It appears plainly how much he miſrepreſents his Author. *Harding* does not mean here the *preſent* Biſhops, nor the Regiſter of their Conſecrations, with their own Names and the Names and Number of the Biſhops at that time who laid Hands upon them; but he ſpeaks of the *former* Biſhops from the Beginning, and calls for a Liſt of their Names, and the Line of their Succeſſion in the Churches; and his Deſign is, not to enquire of their Conſecrations, but whether any of them taught (as he is forward to deny they ever did) the ſame *Doctrine* with the *Engliſh* Proteſtant Biſhops. This is clear from the Words of *Tertullian* which he cites, *Evolvant ordines Epiſcoporum ſuorum, Let them ſhew us the Rolls or Catalogues of their Biſhops*; by which his Meaning is to convince the Hereticks that none of the Biſhops in the Apoſtolick Churches ever maintained their Heretical Doctrines; and for this Purpoſe he re-

[q] Fol. 197. a. [r] Epiſt. 165.

fers

fers them to the Succeſſion of Biſhops in the Churches of *Rome*, *Smyrna* and *Epheſus:* As St. *Auſtin* gives the *Donatiſts* a Liſt of the Biſhops of *Rome*, to ſhew there was not one *Donatiſt* in that Line. Accordingly, *Harding* tells *Jewell* [f], that *reckoning all the Biſhops of* Sarisbury *from* (the laſt before him) *Biſhop* Capon, *to* Auſtin *the Apoſtle of the* Engliſh, *and from him by Pope* Gregory *to St.* Peter, *in all that Row of Biſhops there would be found never a one that believed as* Jewell *believed.* Almoſt all theſe Predeceſſors of *Jewell*'s had been in their Graves many Years, or Centuries of Years; and *Capon* the laſt of them had been deceaſed ſome time before that Prelate was nominated, much more before he was conſecrated Biſhop of that Church: How could *Harding* then, in calling for a Regiſter of his *Predeceſſors*, be underſtood to demand the Regiſter of his *Conſecrators?* Beſides, upon this Suppoſition, that he profeſſed another Doctrine than his Predeceſſors, his Adverſary would have denied him to have the true Succeſſion, tho' he had been obliged to confeſs that he had received true Conſecration; as he does in the Caſe of Arch-Biſhop [r] *Cranmer*, whoſe Conſecration tho' he does not call in queſtion, yet he denies him to be *the Succeſſor of* (the Arch-Biſhop before him) *Biſhop* Warham, *in the Chair of* Canterbury.

3. But the Writer of the *Nullity* himſelf will ſave us any farther Trouble, and ſhew that he never had any Intention to repreſent his Author's Meaning or Words truly and fairly, but to impoſe upon his credulous Catholick Readers by a *pious Fraud*, for want of better Evidence to make good his Aſſertion that *Harding* had *preſſed our Biſhops to ſhew the Regiſter.* The Citation, "Shew

That Author convicted of a plain Forgery and Falſification of Harding's *Words.*

[f] Detect. fol. 194, 195. a. [r] Detect. f. 204. a.

" us the Regiſter of your Biſhops, *&c.* Shew us " your Letters of Orders," proves it manifeſtly. After the Words *your Biſhops* (that they may be taken not for the former, but the preſent Biſhops) he leaves out the Words *ſucceeding one another from the Beginning, ſo as that the firſt have ſome one of the Apoſtles or Apoſtolick Men for his Author and Predeceſſor*; which clearly determine the Senſe of the foregoing Words, *the Regiſter of your Biſhops*, to be quite different from that which it is his Deſign to put upon them. This is his firſt Step; the next is, to cover the Omiſſion of thoſe Words *ſucceeding one another from the Beginning*, with an *&c.* as if the Words he conceals from the Reader were no more pertinent or coherent to the Words foregoing, or to the Author's Subject of our Want of Succeſſion in point of Doctrine, than any Part of a Period, that is left out with the ſame Mark, to denote that more might be added if it were not unneceſſary and ſuperfluous. It is juſt the ſame as if I were giving an account of this Writer's Work, under the Title of *The Nullity of the Prelatick Clergy, &c.* and no more, and ſhould go on by favour of this Trick to lead the Reader into an Opinion, that his Subject is to diſprove the *Orders of the Church* (not of *England*, but) *of* Rome. This would be doing as great Juſtice to this Author as he does to *Harding*. His laſt Artifice is to blind his Reader with other Words of the Author, which he finds at a diſtance[y], *Shew us the Letters of your Orders*, and joins them to the Words before, *Shew us the Regiſter of your Biſhops*, for a Key to unlock their Meaning. In that Place *Harding* is objecting to his Adverſary the Want of Vocation and Ordination, and if the Words had been, Shew us the *Regiſter* (inſtead of the *Letters*) *of your Orders*, it would have been enough alone

[y] Detect. fol. 197. a.

 by

by it ſelf, to prove that he called for the Regiſter of *Jewell*'s Conſecration; but it wanted only the Word *Regiſter*. The former Part of his Citation has the Word expreſly, *the Regiſter of your Biſhops*; but then it is upon the Subject of Succeſſion, and not of Vocation: put both together, in the Manner that this Writer has the Skill to do, and each of them makes up the Deficiency of the other, *Shew us the Regiſter of your Biſhops*, of their *Orders and Conſecration*, and the whole amounts to a compleat Proof of *Harding*'s having called for the Regiſter of *Jewell*'s Conſecration in expreſs Terms.

The confident Uſe that he makes of this Forgery thro'out his Book.

Here we ſee that, to ſeem to make good his former Aſſertion, of the Regiſter's being *frequently and conſtantly called for by their Doctors*, he attempts to run down Biſhop *Bramhall*, and to put a Cheat upon his Readers, by an open and palpable Forgery, and a premeditated and deliberate Falſification of the Words of his Author. And yet, as if this were a fair Proof of his Point, he proceeds upon it as undoubted Matter of Fact, and makes it the Ground of his Reply throughout his Book, to any thing that the Biſhop ſays, as he finds Occaſion. The Reader will ſee it twice done in the next Page [w], where he ſays that Harding *had called for the Regiſter before the Act was made in Parliament*, 8 Eliz. *and ſeven Years before the Book of the ſeventy Arch-Biſhops of* Canterbury *was printed*. And ſo again [x], *That the Regiſter was called for frequently and earneſtly in the Beginning of Queen* Elizabeth's *Reign*. [y] That *our firſt Superintendents never durſt ſend* Harding, *or any of the reſt that deſired it, an authentick Copy of thoſe* Records *out of their Regiſtry*. [z] That Parker *or* Jewell *ought to have remitted* Harding *to theſe Regiſters, when he ſo earneſtly called for them,*

[w] Nullity, p. 3. [x] P. 5. [y] P. 28. [z] P. 29.

Shew us your Regiſters, in the Year 1566. [a] That Bramhall *had Reaſon to commend* Jewell's *Prudence* (that is the Turn which he gives to the Biſhop's Words, that nothing urged by their Doctors required *that we ſhould cite the Regiſters in Prudence*) *for not anſwering* Harding *when he preſſed him to ſhew the Regiſters of his Biſhops and his Letters of Orders.* And [b] That Jewell *in his Anſwer to* Harding *cites no Regiſters, tho' his Adverſary called for them expreſly, Shew us your Regiſters.*

Juſt Reflections upon the Character of that Writer.

We ſee how full the Author was of this Diſcovery from *Harding*, and how often he inſiſts upon it as a Matter out of all Diſpute. And is not this the ſame Writer (for himſelf owns that his former Treatiſe was the Work of but one, and not, as Biſhop *Bramhall* thought, of *two Fathers* of the *Society*) from whom we have the ſcandalous Story [c] of the Speech of a Proteſtant Biſhop, to *prove the Succeſſion of* our Prelates *from the laſt Catholick Biſhops who* (as he makes Biſhop *Morton* ſay) *by Impoſition of Hands ordained the firſt Proteſtant Biſhops at the* Nag's-Head *in* Cheapſide, *as was notorious to all the World?* A Story which (beſides its proving itſelf to be falſe, by its contradicting the *Grand Fable* which it was deſigned to ſupport, and transforming the Proteſtant Conſecrator there, the *Apoſtate Prieſt Scory*, into *more than one* of the *laſt Engliſh* Biſhops of the Church of *Rome*) was demonſtrated, by the [d] Proteſtations of the injured Biſhop, (one in a Codicil annexed to his Will, with a Declaration of his Faith, and a ſhort Vindication of himſelf from this Slander; and two others in a larger Vindication ſigned and ſealed in the Preſence of a Publick Notary, by whom they are atteſted as well as by other Wit-

[a] P. 31. [b] P. 69. [c] Treatiſe of Catholick Faith and Hereſy, p. 9. Bramhall's Works, p. 430. [d] Bramhall's Works, p. 432, 433, 434. F. Le Courayer's Diſſertation, p. 356. to p. 360. His Defence, Vol. 2. p. 515. to p. 518.

neſſes,

neſſes, declared by the ſame Notaries to be then preſent) and by other Teſtimonies of the greateſt Authority and Weight, to be nothing elſe but a wicked Lie and a baſe Calumny. Should not this Blot upon the Author's Reputation have obliged him to be cautious either never to write again, or to let nothing drop from his Pen but what was agreeable to the ſtricteſt and moſt exact Truth and Sincerity? And yet we find him, in the very Entrance upon his *Defence*, ſhewing us another Trick of the ſame Nature, and putting a Speech into *Harding*'s Mouth, contrary, as his own Conſcience told him, to the Author's plain and unqueſtionable Meaning, and proved to be ſo, by his own extraordinary Contrivance to lay the Words before his Readers in a falſe Light. Is not this a good Preparation for us, as well as for Father *Le Quien* and the *Remarker*, (if they read the Writer himſelf, and did not only tranſcribe what they found in the Notes of the *Poet Ward*) to give Credit to his Second Report (to confirm his former of *Morton*'s Speech) of the Lord *Audley*'s *Teſtification upon Oath*, of his having heard that Speech? An Oath taken before no Body, that we hear of, qualified to give authentick Evidence of that Lord's having made Oath before him of the Truth of his Depoſition, nor before any Witneſſes preſent at his making and ſwearing to the Truth of this Depoſition; which yet we are to believe was both made and ſworn to, upon this Author's bare Word in his laſt Chapter; tho' we have ſo very little Reaſon to depend upon his Integrity and Veracity, from his putting ſuch a Cheat upon his Readers in the firſt Chapter, and carrying it on thro' the Book, and even in this laſt Chapter aſking *Bramhall* [c], "Why the Records "of our Pretended Solemnity at *Lambeth* were

[c] P. 87.

" not produced, when ſome Evidence was deſired
" of our firſt Biſhops to clear their Conſecrations,
" and the *very Regiſters ſo earneſtly called for?*"

Proved from the Reaſon of Harding's *Demand of the Letters of Orders, that his Objection was againſt the* Validity *of the Ordination.*

4. But to ſay nothing more of his artful, but ſcandalous, Management of his Cauſe, it is eaſy to ſhew to how little Purpoſe it was for him to take ſuch Pains to miſinterpret and falſify thoſe Words of *Harding*. His Words that follow preſently after, in the ſame Page of the *Nullity*, prove (as I have ſhewed before[f]) that it could not be his Meaning to deny that *Jewell* could bring any Proof of the Fact of his Conſecration, but only that he could not ſhew that he had a true and valid Conſecration. Let his Words be, if you pleaſe, *Shew us* (not the *Letters* but) *the Regiſter of your Orders.* Let theſe be his firſt Words. It follows preſently after, *But Order and Conſecration you have not.* Take the Meaning of this to be, " You " had not in Fact any Ordination, or Impoſition " of Hands, nor can ſhew by any Regiſter that " you had Hands laid upon you." Now ſee, in the very next Words, *Harding*'s Reaſon for affirming this; *For who could give that to you of all theſe New Miniſters, howſoever elſe you call them, which he hath not himſelf?* He denies *Jewell* to have the Epiſcopal Order, becauſe none of the Proteſtant Miniſters could give him the Order: and why? Becauſe they had not received the Epiſcopal Order themſelves. Does he mean that their not having the Order themſelves made it impoſſible for any of them to lay their Hands upon *Jewell*, and to take upon them to give him the Order? Or muſt he not neceſſarily be underſtood to mean, that this made it impoſſible for them to give him a true and valid Conſecration, that is, by Impoſition of Hands, or any other Act of

[f] Sup. p. 362, 363.

theirs,

theirs, to confer upon him the Epiſcopal Order? To ſuppoſe the former to be his Meaning, is to make him ſo abſurd as to ſay that no Perſon that is not a Biſhop can in fact take upon him to act as a Biſhop; contrary to that which he owns to be Fact a little before in the Caſe of *Colluthus*'s ordaining *Iſchyras*, and to that which it is his whole Buſineſs to lay to the Charge of *Jewell*, and the reſt of our Prelates, their preſuming to execute the Epiſcopal Function without ever having received the Order and Character. And yet this muſt be his Meaning, if his Demand of the *Letters of Orders* be for a Proof of *Jewell*'s being ordained in fact: Which Proof *Jewell* might have exhibited, and ſhewed that he had Hands laid upon him by Arch-Biſhop *Parker*, and three more Proteſtant Biſhops; and have made the like Proof of *Parker*'s Ordination, that he had Impoſition of Hands from *Barlow* and three other Biſhops, and yet the Reaſon of *Harding*'s Objection would have had ſtill its full Force, "Order and Conſecra-" tion you have not; for none of theſe *Proteſtant* " *Miniſters*, by what other Names ſoever you " call them, of *Arch-Biſhop* or *Biſhops*, could " give you the true Epiſcopal Order, or a valid " Conſecration, becauſe they never had it them-" ſelves."

5. But *Le Quien* tells us [g], if *Jewell* had *produced the Act of his Conſecration*, or *referred* Harding *to the Regiſter of the Arch-Biſhop*, *or* named *the Perſons who were his Conſecrators*, *this*, *if done*, *would have ſtopt his Adverſary's Mouth:* And does the *Father* think thus in earneſt? It would, as has been ſhewed before [h], have ſtopt his Mouth juſt as effectually, as *Iſchyras* might have ſilenced

Tho' Jewell had produced the Regiſter, it would not have been a ſatisfactory Anſwer to his Adverſary.

[g] T. 1. p. 296. Sup. p. 349. 362, 363, 364.

[h] Sup. p. 348, 349.

Athanaſius

Athanaſius and the other Biſhops, by producing Letters Teſtimonial from *Colluthus*, of his having given him the Order of Prieſthood. *Harding* muſt have been utterly ſilenced, having nothing to ſay but what *Athanaſius* and thoſe Biſhops ſaid, that tho' ſome ſuch Perſons as *Colluthus* had taken upon them in fact to lay Hands upon *Jewell*, pretending to ordain him Prieſt, and conſecrate him Biſhop, yet they could not give him either of theſe ſacred Orders truly and validly, being, as *Colluthus* was, never conſecrated Biſhops themſelves. To clear this, and to ſhew how far *Jewell* would have come ſhort either of convincing and ſilencing his Adverſary, or of giving him any reaſonable Satisfaction by ſuch an Anſwer as *Le Quien* preſcribes, we need only take a ſhort Review of *Harding*'s Demands and his Queſtions to *Jewell*, and the Reaſons which he gives to enforce them. He demands that he ſhould prove [i] *by what Authority he uſurps* his Office; *what he can alledge for the Right and Proof of his Miniſtry?* He requires him to [k] *ſhew that he has received Power to do the Office he preſumes to exerciſe, by due Order of laying on of Hands and Conſecration.* Would *Jewell*'s proving the Fact of his Ordination, that he had Impoſition of Hands from ſome Perſons whom *Harding* would preſently declare to be no Biſhops, oblige him either to be ſilent, or to own that *Jewell* had made full Proof of that *Right*, *Authority* and *Power*, to execute his Function, which he had before challenged him to prove? Beſides, he calls in queſtion his having received ſo much as Prieſt's Orders, and gives this Reaſon for it, becauſe to give the Order of Prieſthood [l] *was never in the Power of any but a Biſhop.* Could it be a ſatisfactory Anſwer for *Jewell* to ſhew that he had Hands laid upon him for that

[i] Detect. f. 195. a. [k] Ibid. f. 197. a. [l] Ibid. f. 195. a.

Purpoſe,

Purpoſe, by ſome Perſon who his Adverſary would ſay was no Biſhop? He denies likewiſe his having the Epiſcopal Order, becauſe [m] *Biſhops* were always conſecrated by Biſhops, and by no fewer, *according to the* Canons, than *three Biſhops.* Would *Jewell*'s ſhewing from the Regiſter the Names of four Perſons that were his Conſecrators, every one of whom *Harding* would deny to be any thing more than a Prieſt, ſtop *Harding*'s Mouth; or make him confeſs that his Adverſary had a true and canonical Conſecration from three or four Biſhops? In ſhort, *Harding* pronounces in general at the firſt, that the Proteſtants *had no Conſecrated Biſhops in their Sect*, and afterwards [n], that none of the [o] *New Miniſters*, however dignified in Name and Title, had themſelves the Epiſcopal Order or Conſecration, and therefore were all of them uncapable to give it to *Jewell*, or any Body elſe. Could *Jewell*'s producing the Names of four of the New Proteſtant Clergy, one Arch-Biſhop, and three Biſhops, (ſo called) be ſufficient to convince his Adverſary that theſe four were conſecrated Biſhops, and had themſelves received due Order and Conſecration, and conſequently had conferred the ſame upon him? If *Le Quien* ſees now, from the very Words of his Author, that *Jewell*'s producing the *Act of his Conſecration*, or *Letters Teſtimonial* from the Arch-Biſhop, or *referring Harding* for both to the *Arch-Biſhop's Regiſter*, or *naming* the Perſons that conſecrated him, would by no means have come up to the leaſt Appearance of a convincing or ſatisfactory Anſwer to his Adverſary; then let the *Father*, if he pleaſes, apply to himſelf that Return which *Harding* in Reaſon would have made to this Anſwer of *Jewell*'s. " You are ſo weak, or diſingenuous, " as to take my Meaning to be, to require no-

[m] Ibid. [n] Fol. 194. b. [o] Fol. 197. a.

" thing

" thing more to the Proof of your Miniſtry, but " a ſight of the Names of thoſe Perſons, be they " who they would, that took upon them to give " you Impoſition of Hands, and performed the " Office preſcribed in King *Edward*'s Ordinal for " the making of Biſhops and Prieſts; but you " are very much miſtaken, for their very Names " which you give me are enough to prove that " tho' you were ordained by thoſe Perſons, yet " you have had none but Presbyters at your Or- " dination, not one that was a *Conſecrated Biſhop*, " and therefore I muſt ſtill declare that you were " neither ordained Prieſt, or conſecrated Biſhop, " by ſuch an Ordination."

LeQuien's *Reflections upon* Jewell's *Anſwer to* Harding *as* ſhuffling *and* evaſive.

6. But the *Father* is at leaſt ſatisfied that *Jewell* himſelf underſtood *Harding* as he does, and conſequently looked upon himſelf to be obliged, in anſwer to his Demands and Queſtions, to make Proof that he was ordained in fact; and being ſo unhappy as to have no Evidence of the Fact to produce, nothing to lay before his Adverſary of an authentick Inſtrument of his Conſecration, either from an Act of it in the Regiſter, or Letters under the Hand of the Arch-Biſhop, depoſited there, as the *Father* imagines to be the Practice; being under theſe Difficulties, he had no other way to anſwer, but (as the *Father* ſays [p], *en biaiſant*) by *ſhifting* and *ſhuffling*, and uſing what *Tricks* and *Evaſions* he could. Let us, if the Reader pleaſes, attend *Le Quien* in this Diſcovery. He tells us, *Jewell* at firſt anſwers, by *demanding what Canon of the Church it is that ordains, that a Biſhop be conſecrated by three Biſhops*; and then remarks, *That it is the Celebrated* Jewell, *that Great Maſter of the* Engliſh *Proteſtants, who asks this Queſtion!* This is to give us, as well as his own Party, a true

[p] T. 1. p. 296.

Meaſure

Meaſure of the Learning and Abilities of a Writer, whom we, at leaſt, might otherwiſe be apt to have in Admiration; but this will teach us to underſtand better, how little it was, if any, Skill and Knowledge in Divinity, that our Great *Maſter* could pretend to, when we find he knew ſo little of the Canons of the Church as to want to be informed by his Adverſary, of this Queſtion. But the *Father* may appear to be too haſty to lead the Learned Biſhop in Triumph, before he is ſure of a Victory over him: And the Reader, if he has ſo much Patience, will find how little Ground he has to inſult that Prelate, when it is made plain, that all the ſhuffling and tricking in this Matter is to be laid to the Charge only of *Harding* in the firſt place, and *Le Quien* after him. *Harding*'s Words, whereupon he grounds his calling in queſtion *Jewell*'s having been conſecrated Biſhop, are, [q] *Biſhops have always, after the Apoſtles time, according to the Eccleſiaſtical Canons, been conſecrated by three other Biſhops, with the Conſent of the Metropolitan, and Confirmation of the Biſhop of* Rome. Here we have a Declaration of the conſtant Rule and Practice of the Church in ordaining Biſhops, with a Denial implied, that this Rule and Practice was obſerved in the Ordinations of *Jewell* and the reſt of our Biſhops. To both Particulars, his Report of the Canons, and his Denial of their being obſerved by us, the Biſhop gives a very pertinent and direct Anſwer, notwithſtanding *Le Quien* could ſee nothing in it but ſhuffling and Evaſion. The Purport of his Anſwer is, firſt to deny that there is any Truth in that which *Harding* declares of the Canons, in one Particular, *viz.* That they require the Pope's Confirmation, beſides the Act of the three Biſhops whom they require to join in every Biſhop's Conſecration:

Proved that he gives a proper and direct Anſwer.

[q] Detect. f. 195. a.

This

This he tells *Harding* is *a manifeſt Untruth*, and defies him to ſhew any Canons of the Church that require it. Secondly, to affirm, in plain Contradiction to his Adverſary, that in the two other Particulars, which the Canons do really preſcribe, *the Conſent of the Metropolitan*, and *the Conſecration by three Biſhops*, the Rule and Practice of the Church was obſerved in his own and his Brethren's Conſecration. The latter Part of his Anſwer I ſhall give the Reader firſt, becauſe it will effectually clear the Meaning of the former. His Words, when he comes to the proper Place, are, [r] *Our Biſhops are made in Form and Order as they have been ever, by free Election of the Chapter, by Conſecration of the Arch-Biſhop, and other three Biſhops, and by the Admiſſion of the Prince*; to the ſame Purpoſe he ſays again, [s] *We ſucceed the Biſhops that have been before our Days; we are elected, conſecrated, confirmed, and admitted, as they were.* Here, beſides that Part which uſed to be acted by the Chapter of the vacant See, in the Election of the new Biſhop, and the Prince's Part in the Admiſſion or Inveſtiture of the Biſhop, he aſſerts that himſelf and the reſt of the Biſhops were made with the Concurrence of the Arch-Biſhop or Metropolitan in his Part, *viz.* the Confirmation of the Biſhops elect, and his either preſiding himſelf in the Conſecration and Impoſition of Hands, with a ſufficient Number of Biſhops, two or three more, joining with him; or authorizing three of them at the leaſt by his Conſent to act their Part in laying on of Hands, and performing the Office in his Abſence. And this *Jewell* declares to have been done *in Form and Order as it ever had been*, and in the ſame manner *as the Biſhops were made that had been before them*; only leaving out the Pope's Confir-

[r] Def. of the Apol. p. 129. Detect. f. 238. a.
[s] Def. p. 132. Detect. f. 245. b.

mation

mation, which he denied to have any Foundation in the Rules and Canons, or in the original and conſtant Practice of the Church.

But to turn to the firſt Part of his Anſwer, where we find he poſitively denies the Truth of that Particular, in *Harding*'s Account of the *Eccleſiaſtical Canons:* His Words are, "[t] Where you "ſay that according to the Eccleſiaſtical Canons, "ever from the Apoſtles times Biſhops have ever-"more been conſecrated by three other Biſhops, "with the Confirmation of the Biſhop of *Rome*, "as if without him no Man ought to be allowed "to be a Biſhop; you ſhould not ſo unadviſedly "report ſo manifeſt Untruth. For I beſeech you "where be theſe Eccleſiaſtical Canons? Who de-"viſed them? Who made them? Who gave the "Pope that ſingular Privilege, that no Biſhops "ſhould be admitted in all the World but only "by him?" Here *Jewell* plainly denies that the Canons require that every Biſhop ſhould be confirmed by the Pope. And what he ſays to *Harding*, if fairly conſidered, muſt be interpreted to have this Meaning, "You ſpeak as if, beſides "the Conſecration of a Biſhop by three Biſhops, "the Canons of the Church did farther require "that every Biſhop in the Church ſhould be con-"firmed by the Biſhop of *Rome*. But pray ſhew "us any ſuch Canons that preſcribe this Rule to "be obſerved by the Church." That this is his Meaning, and he had no Thought of denying that the Canons required three Biſhops to conſecrate a Biſhop, the Words themſelves ſhew in good meaſure; he does not ſay, *as if without three other Biſhops* for his Conſecrators *no Man ought to be allowed to be a Biſhop*; but *as if without the Pope*, that is, without his Confirmation, *no Man ought to be allowed to be a Biſhop*. Nor does he aſk, *Who de-*

[t] Def. p. 125. Deteſt. f. 222. b. 223. a

viſed

viſed or made the Canons that gave this Privilege to three Biſhops, *that no Biſhops ſhould be admitted* but ſuch as were conſecrated by that Number of other Biſhops? but *Who gave the Pope that ſingular Privilege, that no Biſhops ſhould be admitted but only by him?* But his own Words cited before, put this Matter out of Diſpute. *Our Biſhops* (he ſays) *are made in Form and Order, as they have been ever*; that is, in the Form and Order preſcribed by the Church; and one Particular wherein he ſays this Form and Order was obſerved, was in their being made *by the Conſecration of three Biſhops.* This he ſays, as *Harding* himſelf confeſſes, [v] *in the very next Side of the Leaf*; and can it be conceived, that in the very Page before he ſhould poſitively deny that there was any ſuch Form or Order preſcribed by the Church, as the Conſecration of a Biſhop by three Biſhops? But there is nothing ſo weak or abſurd for any Writer to ſay, but we find it can be believed of *Jewell* by one that reads him either with *Harding*'s or *Le Quien*'s Eyes.

Proved that Harding *miſrepreſents and falſifies* Jewell's *Anſwer.*

7. To proceed from his Anſwer in the *Defence*, to *Harding*'s Reply in the *Detection:* Here it will plainly appear how *Harding* ſhifts and ſhuffles, and plays Tricks to *evade* giving a direct Anſwer to *Jewell*'s Challenge for him to produce the Canons of the Church that require every Biſhop to be confirmed by the Pope; how, to ſerve that Deſign, he does not ſtick at a very plain Miſrepreſentation of his Adverſary's Words and Meaning. *Jewell*'s Intention is to call for ſuch *Eccleſiaſtical Canons* (if there were any ſuch to be found) as *give the Pope that ſingular Privilege that no Biſhop ſhall be admitted or allowed to be a Biſhop without* being firſt confirmed by *him.* *Harding* was to look for ſuch Canons, but was ſenſible there were none ſuch to

[v] Detect. f. 223. 2.

be

be found, and therefore offers nothing from the Canons for that purpoſe, but lays the Foundation of that Privilege [w] upon *Chriſt's Favour in giving to St.* Peter's *Succeſſor the Biſhop of* Rome *a Right that no Biſhop ought to be a Biſhop without his Conſent*, and upon the *Communicatory Letters*, that uſed to be ſent to all Biſhops firſt as well as to the Biſhop of *Rome*. He is willing however to make a *Shew* to his Readers of producing the Eccleſiaſtical Canons which *Jewell* calls for, but then he makes them believe that his Adverſary had denied that the Canons required the Conſecration by three Biſhops, and the Metropolitan's Conſent, and upon that Pretence proceeds to expoſe him either for his groſs Ignorance in the Canons of the Church, or his diſſembling what he muſt know very well the Canons required. He begins [x] with citing the firſt of the Canons of the Apoſtles, *Let a Biſhop be ordered (or made Biſhop) by two or three Biſhops*; and then puts it to his Adverſary, *Can you ask, Where be theſe Eccleſiaſtical Canons? Who deviſed them? Who made them?* He proves next, from a *Decree* of *Hilarius*, not from the 4th and 6th Canons of the General Council of *Nice*, that the Metropolitan's Conſent is required. He had ſeen it proved by his Adverſary [y] from the 6th Canon of that Council, and from the Practice of the Church of *Conſtantinople*; and is it poſſible that after he had ſeen *Jewell* make ſuch Proof of it, he could have the Face to ſuggeſt, that the ſame *Jewell* denied that the Canons required the Conſent of the Metropolitan? He goes on to prove the ſame Particulars againſt his Adverſary from his own Confeſſion, and ſets down his Words, *Our Biſhops are made in Form and Order, as they have been ever, by the Conſecration of the Arch-Biſhop and three other Biſhops*; which Words he ſays are *in the very next Side of the Leaf*, after that wherein

[w] Detect. f. 223. b. [x] Ib. f. 223. a. [y] Def. p. 128.

he denies that the Canons require the Conſecration by three Biſhops, and the Metropolitan's Conſent; and then proceeds, " If this be the Form and " Order of making Biſhops that hath been ever, " to be conſecrated by the Arch-Biſhop and three " other Biſhops, why were you ſo hot againſt " me in calling for the Eccleſiaſtical Canons?" Here it appears that he had both ſeen and conſidered what *Jewell* ſays in the next Side of the Leaf, and compared it with what he had ſaid in the Page or Side of the Leaf before. If *Jewell* had juſt before in that Page expreſly denied that the Canons required three Biſhops and the Metropolitan, then he would be plainly convicted, by his own Confeſſion preſently following, of Falſhood in that which he had ſaid juſt before. But if he ſays no more there than indefinitely to aſk, *Where be theſe Eccleſiaſtical Canons?* and explains himſelf immediately, that he means by the Canons thoſe only whereby the Pope's Right of confirming every Biſhop ought to be proved, and in the next Page owns poſitively that it is the Church's *Form and Order* (that is, according to the Canons) for *a Biſhop to be conſecrated by the Arch-Biſhop and three other Biſhops*; can any Man that pretends to write with Truth and Ingenuity, can any one that is not of an hardned Front and ſeared Conſcience, dare to charge him with denying that which ſo plainly appears to be poſitively affirmed by him? Yet this is done by no leſs a Man than Dr. *Harding*, the *Great Maſter* of the Catholick Diſputants, to return F. *Le Quien*'s Civility to Biſhop *Jewell*. He cites theſe Words of *Jewell*'s againſt him, and the Reflection he makes upon them is (not, as his Conſcience muſt tell him, that the Words plainly ſhew that *Jewell* could not mean in the Words before to deny the Conſecration by the Arch-Biſhop and three Biſhops to be according to the Canons, but) that *Jewell* had *quite forgot himſelf* in

ſo little Compaſs as from this to the next Page, and there (inſtead of explaining what he meant before) plainly contradicts and *confutes himſelf*. Is not ſuch a way of writing Controverſy a plain Evidence that the Writer is *in the Gall of Bitterneſs and Bond of Iniquity*, that he can allow himſelf to make ſuch a foul Miſrepreſentation of his Adverſary's Words and Meaning? It will be more clear from what the Biſhop ſays himſelf (who beſt knew his own Meaning) in his Rejoinder to this Part of *Harding*'s Reply in the Additions to his *Defence* of his *Apology* in the Editions of it that followed *Harding*'s *Detection*. " [z] You forget " your ſelf much, Mr. *Harding*. This was not " the Queſtion. You are demanded one thing, " and anſwer another. We deny not the Conſe- " cration of three Biſhops. We deny not the " Confirmation of the Metropolitan. We our " ſelves are ſo conſecrated, and ſo confirmed. " The Matter that lieth between us is this, Whe- " ther throughout the whole Church of *Chriſt*, " no Man may be allowed for a Biſhop without " the Confirmation of the Pope. Thereto I ſay, " Where be your Eccleſiaſtical Canons? Who " deviſed them? Who made them? If you have " any, ſhew them hardily, they will further your " Cauſe. If you have none at all, why ſhould " you vaunt your ſelf of empty Store? Why " ſhould you talk ſo vainly of your Eccleſiaſtical " Canons, ſo old, ſo ancient, ſo long continued " in the Church, from the Apoſtles time until " this day?" This clearly ſhews us what was the true Point of Diſpute between him and *Harding*: Not about the Conſecration by three Biſhops, or the Conſent of the Metropolitan, but the Pope's pretended Right to confirm every Biſhop, not only within his own Province, but throughout

[z] Defence, p. 125.

the whole Church. 'Tis this that *Jewell* denied, but not either of the other two. 'Tis to make Proof of that, and not of them, that he called upon *Harding* to produce the *Eccleſiaſtical Canons*. And he does not only ſay, but prove it, and his Reaſon is, becauſe no Man of Senſe or Candour could believe that he would deny that to be the Form and Order preſcribed by the Church, which he owns to have been obſerved and practiſed as the Church's Form and Order in the Conſecration of himſelf and his Brethren. In this *Harding* ſaw what ſort of Adverſary he ought to have been, and how far he was from being ſo. He was ſo weak and diſingenuous at firſt as to make *Jewell* deny that which he did not deny; and then, when he ſaw that his Words that followed ſoon after proved the contrary, that he could not be thought to deny that to be the Church's Form and Order which he acknowledged to be the Form and Order of the Church; his Conſcience allows him to interpret this not to be a Proof of his true Meaning, but a Self-contradiction and Confutation of that which he had ſaid ſo little before. It is the celebrated Dr. *Harding*, the *Great Champion* at that time for the Church of *Rome*, in whom we find this palpable Sophiſtry and Falſification.

It is proper to obſerve the Difference of Language that we meet with in theſe two Writers. *Jewell*, tho' he had ſufficient Provocation, ſays no more than, "*You forget your ſelf much, Mr.* "Harding; *this was not the Queſtion.*" He had not learned from his Adverſary to ſay, [a] *This is a moſt impudent Lie* of yours, *Mr.* Harding. *Was there ever any Man more impudent than you are?* So plain a Falſification of his Words and Meaning, which *Harding* had the Confidence to be guilty of, might have juſtly occaſioned ſome Expreſ-

[a] Detect. f. 232. b.

ſions

ſions of Reſentment in a very meek Man: But the Biſhop could not ſo much as dip his Pen in that Gall which any one that reads *Harding* will find flows ſo readily from his Pen, in ſo many Pages of his *Confutation* and *Detection*.

8. To return now to F. *Le Quien*, whoſe pleaſant Diſcovery of our *Great Maſter Jewell*'s Ignorance in the known Canons of the Church [b] obliged me to lay before the Reader the true Account of that Part of the Diſpute between him and his Adverſary. *Le Quien* only copies from *Harding*, as it is very reaſonable to think he does, and that he read nothing of what *Jewell* ſays more than what *Harding* has from him: But ſhould not any impartial Man that takes upon him to be a Judge between the two Parties in the Diſpute, have read, and conſidered with due Attention, what is ſaid by each of them, before he proceeds to paſs ſo ſevere a Cenſure upon one of the two? If the *Father* could have had the Patience to have taken ſo little Pains, he would have ſeen that *Harding*, and not *Jewell*, was the *Shuffler:* That becauſe he cannot produce the Canons that were demanded, he puts a Cheat upon the Reader by ſhewing ſuch as were never called for, and miſrepreſents his Adverſary as denying that there were any ſuch Canons; in which foul Miſrepreſentation, *Father Le Quien* was too well prepared to follow him implicitly, and make it a Matter of great Triumph on their Side. It muſt be more inexcuſable in *Le Quien*, if he had ſeen (as he ought to have done) *Jewell*'s Declaration of his own Meaning in the *Additions* to his *Defence*. This muſt have ſet the Matter before him in a true Light, and prevented his making himſelf accountable for the ſame Weakneſs and Inſince-

[b] T. 1. p. 296. ſup. p. 412.

rity which otherwiſe could be laid to the Charge of none but *Harding*.

If the Reader had the reſt of their Diſpute about this Point laid before him, it would appear how little Reaſon our Adverſaries have to boaſt of the Succeſs of their *Champion* againſt his *Antagoniſt*; but I ſhall only take Notice of the Concluſion of the Debate. *Jewell* diſproves the Pope's *Univerſal Right* to confirm every Biſhop, from [c] the ſixth Canon of the Council of *Nice* cited by *Gratian*, whereby that Right is reſerved to the Metropolitans in their ſeveral Provinces; and from the Practice of the Church of *Conſtantinople*, atteſted by *Socrates* in his Hiſtory, that no Biſhop ſhould be made within the Juriſdiction of the Biſhop of that See, but by his Conſent. *Harding*, as before, offers no Canons to prove the contrary, but makes a Shew of proving the Right of the Biſhop of *Rome* by Cuſtom and Practice, which he tells *Jewell* [d], *appears by many Examples, which would require a Diſcourſe over long for this Place.* We could not wiſh him to be made more ridiculous, than he is by the Biſhop upon this Occaſion, without taking his own Way, by giving him the *Lye* [e]. "O Mr. *Harding*, will you deal ſo ſtraitly with your Friends? Of ſo many and ſo many Examples may we not ſee ſo much as one? I ſpeak not now of Biſhops within the Territory of the *Roman* Province; for they were confirmed by the Biſhop of *Rome*. I ſpeak of the Biſhops of other Churches and Juriſdictions throughout the World. You ſay, *It would require a Diſcourſe over long for this Place*; therefore it was good Skill thus curſorily to paſs it over. Silence ſerveth beſt, where nothing can be ſaid." Let *Le Quien* tell us who it was that

[c] Defence, p. 128. Detect. f. 226. b. [d] Detect. f. 227. a.
[e] Defence, ibid.

was

was ſilenced here, and never offered to make a Rejoinder, but left it to him or any Body elſe to produce *Harding*'s *many Examples*. The like Reply of *Jewell*'s may be ſeen to the Pretence [f] That after the *Cuſtom of Communicatory Letters ceaſed, inſtead of them* the Biſhops were only to ſend to the Biſhop of *Rome* for his *Confirmation*.

9. *Jewell* proceeds to ſhew his Adverſary that it may be [g] *queſtioned whether what he ſays is true*, That a Biſhop was *always* conſecrated by *three Biſhops*; becauſe two of their own Doctors, *Petrus Paludanus* and *Johannes Major*, own that *one Biſhop is enough* to conſecrate a Biſhop. Here he does, as we are told by *Le Quien* [h], *give us ſufficiently to underſtand, that he was not made Biſhop by more than one Perſon whom he took for a Biſhop, which Perſon might be no other than* John Scory *mentioned in the Tavern Story*. Is it poſſible that the *Father* could let himſelf down ſo low in point of Reaſoning, as he does in this judicious Obſervation? *Jewell* ſays one Biſhop is enough to conſecrate a Biſhop. He may therefore fairly be ſuppoſed to declare his Senſe, that if he had been ordained by one Biſhop only, his Conſecration would have been valid and effectual, tho' not agreeable to the *Canons*, which he (as well as *Paludanus*) owns, require that *for the greater Solemnity* a Biſhop ſhould be conſecrated by *three other Biſhops joining together*. But is this the ſame as to own, that he himſelf had *in fact* but *one* Conſecrator (eſpecially when he ſoon declares that he had the *Arch-Biſhop and three others*) and more than that, that *Scory* of all Men muſt be the Perſon, and the Place of Conſecration the *Nag's-Head?* Is this to be looked upon as a good Argument, and not rather as a weak and (I may

LeQuien's interpreting Jewell's *Words of a Conſecration being valid tho' by one Biſhop as if he owned that himſelf was conſecrated only by* Scory *at the* Tavern.

[f] Detect. fol. 234. b. Defence, p. 129.
[g] Defence, ibid. Detect. f. 228. [h] T. 1. p. 302.

add) ſcandalous Surmiſe? And could not the *Father*, when he had this Thought, have reflected that this alone is enough to demoliſh his whole Superſtructure of the *Nag's-Head* Story upon this Foundation? For does it not prove that no ſuch Fact ever came to *Harding*'s Knowledge? Or is it poſſible that if it had, he could have been ſo ſhort-ſighted, or blinded with Prejudice in favour of *Jewell*, as not to hit this Blot, and ſee what *Le Quien*, with half an Eye, could preſently diſcover? Could *Harding* have forborne to bring him to a plain Confeſſion from his own Words, by whom *alone* it was that he received his Conſecration, and in what Place, and with what Company? Or muſt we ſay that *Harding* had more Charity, than it ſuits *Le Quien*'s Zeal to have, for an Heretical Prelate of the Church of *England*.

The *Biſhop*'s Meaning was, as *Harding* underſtood him, that a Biſhop might be truly and validly conſecrated by *one* only of the Order, tho' the Canons of the Church require *three*. This his Adverſary interprets to be what *Paludanus*[i] means may be done *in a Caſe of Extremity*: And takes this Handle to reproach *Jewell*, as if he pretended to juſtify his Want of a Canonical Conſecration by the Plea of *Neceſſity*. The Biſhop has not the leaſt Syllable that implies ſuch a Plea, but it was for his *Adverſary*'s Convenience to underſtand him ſo, in order to expoſe him. And what does he ſay upon this Ground? "[k] My Talk was to you, "Mr. *Jewell*, and your Fellows, who, in a Realm "that hath not lacked Biſhops in it for theſe "thirteen hundred Years, ought not now to pre-"tend any *Neceſſity*, as if three Biſhops, either "in that Country or in the next, could not be "found, who might ſolemnize your Conſecra-"tion." The Biſhop had not either Leiſure or

[i] Detect. ibid. [k] Detect. ibid.

Incli-

Inclination to call *Harding* to an account for ſo many impertinent Excurſions as any one will find that reads his *Detection*; but if he had been ſo inclined, he could not have had a fairer Opportunity than he has here, to ſhew his Impertinence and Unreaſonableneſs. He is told by him that *he and his Fellows* could not plead the Caſe of *Neceſſity*, there being no *Lack of Biſhops to conſecrate them, in this Country or in the next.* What Biſhops does he mean, of which there was no Lack? Biſhops of the Church of *Rome*; for he will not allow the Proteſtants to have any. If our Prelates then had offered themſelves to theſe Biſhops, upon what Terms muſt they have received Conſecration from their Hands? they muſt have abjured the Supremacy of their own Prince, and taken an Oath to the pretended Supremacy of the Biſhop of *Rome*, ſo preſumptuouſly challenged, and ſo ſcandalouſly executed, under the Title of the *Regalia* of St. *Peter*; they muſt have renounced the Proteſtant Religion, and profeſſed that they did believe all the falſe Doctrines of the Church of *Rome*, and that they would obſerve all their corrupt Practices. Was there then no *Neceſſity*, for Men of their Profeſſion in point of Religion, to look for Ordination elſewhere, rather than to be conſecrated upon Terms ſo inconſiſtent with a good Conſcience? *Harding* tells *Jewell*, in a Page or two, that he was, at the time of *Jewell*'s Election to the See of *Salisbury*, (and was *yet in right*, at the time when he writ) [1] *Prebendary and Treaſurer of that Church.* *Jewell* might have aſked him, Why was he then ſo weak, as to ſuffer himſelf to be deprived of his Preferments for refuſing to take the Oath of Supremacy, when he was under no Neceſſity to refuſe it? Or why were their Biſhops ſo weak as to be deprived, without

[1] Detect. fol. 233. a.

any

any Neceſſity, upon the ſame account? What Return muſt the Biſhop have had from his haughty and ſpiteful Adverſary? "Could he be ſo weak (he would have ſaid) "as to think that they "were under no *Neceſſity* to refuſe an Oath which "no good *Catholick* could take with a ſafe Con-"ſcience?" The like Anſwer he might have made to himſelf, in the Name of the Biſhop and his Brethren, who could not but refuſe, if they would act the Part of ſincere *Proteſtants*, to be conſecrated by their Biſhops upon ſuch Terms as they would have impoſed upon them. Not to mention, that their Biſhops at home were rendered uncapable by their Deprivation to execute their Functions, ſo as to give any other Perſons a *legal* Conſecration.

Harding's *reflecting upon* Jewell's *pleading Neceſſity, without expoſing him for his Conſecration at the* Nag's-Head, *ſhews that he knew nothing of it.*

But was *Harding* well awake and in his Wits, to make this trifling Objection, upon the Suppoſition of *Jewell*'s pretending *the Caſe of Neceſſity*, and not to turn upon him immediately with that which would have put him and *his Fellows* to the utmoſt Confuſion? Did he not know, as they pretend, by what Perſon, and in what Place, and in how ſcandalous a manner he and his Brethren had been conſecrated? Are we not aſſured by the Advocates for the *Fable*, that he was fully inſtructed, ſoon after the time, in the Particulars of that Tranſaction? And could he then be ſilent here, and not take the Advantage of calling his Adverſary to account? "Can you have the Face to "pretend *Neceſſity* for your *Nag's-Head* Conſecra-"tion? Were you under a Neceſſity to have not "only no Number of Biſhops for your Conſecra-"tors, but to have no Perſon at all to do the Of-"fice, but only one *Apoſtate Prieſt?* Can you "plead Neceſſity for turning your Backs upon all "the Churches and Chapels, and going to a Ta-"vern for Conſecration? for rejecting both the "*Roman* Pontifical, and your own Ordinal, and

"being

" being made Biſhops without the Ceremonies " preſcribed by either of them, and without any " Divine Service, or the leaſt Religious Solemni- " ty? Can any Neceſſity be pretended for this " Mockery and Profaneneſs?" Had not *Harding* (whoſe *Detection* ſhews how far he is from being wanting in Words) a Theme preſented to him here for a long Declamation full of Satyr and Invective againſt the *Engliſh* Proteſtant Biſhops? And could he fail to exert himſelf upon the Occaſion, and expatiate, when he had ſo large a Field lay open before him? Here therefore our Adverſaries may ſee a plain Proof, that he never had any Information of that which they would fain make him an *Evidence* for. The *Remarker* gives us this Paſſage in the *Detection* at full length [m], and then ſays, *We muſt think him mad to lay ſuch a Charge againſt the New Prelates, of their breaking the ancient Cuſtom of being conſecrated by three Biſhops, if the contrary Fact was notorious.* This is agreeable to that Writer's Way of Reaſoning, wherein he ſhews he has little Ground for ſo much Confidence. Could he not ſee that his Author might lay it to the Charge of our New Prelates, that they were not conſecrated according to the Canons, by three Biſhops, ſuch as *Harding* allowed to be true and lawful Biſhops; and yet it might be well known to him, as well as publick and notorious to every Body elſe, that they were conſecrated by three or more *Proteſtant* Biſhops, ſuch as the Proteſtants owned and knew to be true and lawful Biſhops, tho' *Harding* and thoſe of his Perſuaſion denied them to have the Epiſcopal Order? if theſe two things might be very well conſiſtent, what muſt we think of the *Remarker*'s Abilities in point of Argument? 'Tis with the like Strength of Reaſon that he proves *Jewell* to be *ſo* [n] *weak* and *ſilly*, in

[m] P. 62. [n] Ibid. p. 63.

not

not *anſwering* to this *Charge*, *when he might ſo eaſily do it*; and *omitting ſo fair an Opportunity of confounding his* Adverſary *with the Regiſter and the notorious Solemnity of the Fact*, of *his and* Parker's *Conſecration by three Biſhops*. Suppoſe *Jewell* had thought himſelf obliged upon this Occaſion to produce the Regiſter, and to ſhew that he was *conſecrated in a ſolemn manner*, by four *Biſhops*, *Parker*, *Grindall*, *Cox* and *Hodgskins*; would this have confounded *Harding?* Or would he not have ſaid, "the Canons require a Biſhop to be conſe-"crated by three (not pretended but) true and "lawful Biſhops, and do you offer to prove your "Conſecration to be according to the Canons, "becauſe it was ſolemnized by theſe four of your "*New Miniſters*, who I told you before had *no* "*Order or Conſecration themſelves*, and therefore "could none of them *give it to you?*" Suppoſe he ſhould have made the like Proof for *Parker* from the Regiſter, that he was ſolemnly conſecrated by *Barlow*, *Scory*, *Coverdale*, and *Hodgskins*, would not *Harding* have replied, "Did I not tell "you at the firſt that *you had no Conſecrated Bi-*"*ſhops in your Sect?* and can you then pretend "that *Parker* had a true Conſecration from theſe "four of *your Sect*, not one of whom were *Conſe-*"*crated Biſhops?*" We ſee now what a *fair Opportunity Jewell*, in the *Remarker*'s Opinion, had not the Wit to make uſe of, of putting his Adverſary to Confuſion. But could not the Author of the *Remarks* have turned his Eyes another way, and reflected a little upon *Harding*'s Conduct, in this Place which he cites from him? Muſt he not think him to have been *wild* and *mad*, or very *weak* and *ſilly*, to be ſo *unwarrantably dumb*, and to *omit ſo fair an Opportunity of confounding* Jewell, when he ſaw him pretending Neceſſity for his Conſecration, and knew that all the Conſecration that he and his Brethren had was at the *Ta-*

vern, &c.? Could he then forbear aſking him, Who was it that laid a Neceſſity upon you to be ſo conſecrated? and telling him it muſt be none but *He* whoſe *Miniſters* they are, whoſe Church that *foul-mouthed* Writer calls the *Synagogue of Satan*, and treats them in ſo many Places, as *Scholars* of that *School-Maſter*, and *Children of their Father the Devil?* as the Reader may ſee in what the Biſhop ſets down at the End of his Preface (in the *Edition* of his *Defence* after the *Detection) of the principal Flowers* (as he calls them) *of Mr.* Harding's *modeſt Speech.* If ſuch a Writer can be ſuppoſed to be ſo modeſt as to hold his Tongue, and not to publiſh his Knowledge of this Fact, from the *Regiſter* of the *Nag's-Head*, (in *Neal's*, ſuppoſe, or *Bonner's* Cuſtody) and from the Notoriety of it at that time, then let the *Remarker* and *Le Quien* alledge him for a Witneſs of the Truth and Certainty of that Story.

Harding, almoſt in the very next Words, ſhews how little he could forbear to urge againſt his Adverſary any thing that came into his Head, however trifling and impertinent; much leſs could he have paſſed over that Hiſtory of his Ordination, which muſt have effectually put an end to *Jewell's* and his Brethren's Pretenſions to the Epiſcopal Order. The Biſhop, beſides *Paludanus*, had cited *John Major*, a *ſcholaſtic* Writer. Here he takes him to Taſk, for [o] *alledging the Schoolmen who are well known to be contrary to him*, and *if he will ſtand to their Judgment, convince him for an Heretick and Schiſmatick*, as he begins to ſhew by inſtancing in ſome of the Popiſh Doctrines maintained by thoſe Writers, the propitiatory Sacrifice in their Maſs, the offering of it for the Living and Dead, the Prieſthood of the New Teſtament, and the Tranſubſtantiation of the Sacred Elements into Chriſt's

[o] Detect. f. 229. a.

Body;

Body; and he might have gone on to all the reſt of the Points of Controverſy between their Church and ours, wherein the Schoolmen agree with them. And is not this very much to the Purpoſe? Juſt as much as if the Biſhop had urged ſome Conceſſion of *Harding*'s againſt him, and he ſhould have replied, "If you believe me in that Particular, "why do you not likewiſe believe me in all the "other Points wherein *I am contrary to you, and, "if you will ſtand to my Judgment, convince you for "an Heretick and Schiſmatick?*" The reſt that he ſays is almoſt as impertinent: It is grounded upon a Suppoſal of the Biſhop's making uſe of another Pretence to juſtify his not being conſecrated by three Biſhops, *viz.* That this Injunction of the Canons is (as *Major* ſays) *an Ordinance made by Man.* If he had his Eyes open, he could not but have ſeen that the Biſhop had declared more than once, that himſelf and the other Biſhops were conſecrated according to the Church's *Form and Order, by three Biſhops*; ſo that his Adverſary could not with any Sincerity pretend to underſtand him, as if he granted that they were otherwiſe made, and offered to make Excuſes for it, either from Neceſſity, or from this other Pretence.

Jewell [p] next proceeds to give a direct Anſwer to the Queſtions about his Vocation to the Prieſthood and the Epiſcopal Order. From his Anſwer to the firſt, *Le Quien* might have ſeen, with a little Trouble, firſt, that *Harding*'s Call for the *Letters of Orders*, was, as *Jewell* plainly underſtands it, for his Letters Teſtimonial of his Ordination to the *Prieſthood*; and not, as he and the Author of the *Nullity* would have it, for the Act of his Epiſcopal Conſecration in the Regiſter, nor, as he is pleaſed to tell us, with equal Ignorance and Aſſurance, for *Letters* Teſtimonial of his *Con-*

[p] Defence, p. 129. Detect. f. 229. b. 232. a. 234. a.

ſecration

ſecration repoſited in the (Arch-Biſhop's) *Regiſter.* *Jewell's* Anſwer to this Demand is, plainly, *I am a Prieſt made long ſince, &c.* To the other Queſtion it is that he anſwers, *I am a Biſhop*, and what follows. Secondly, the *Father* might have ſeen that he anſwers directly, that he was made Prieſt by the Form in King *Edward's* Ordinal, *by the Order and Ordinance* in uſe *in the time of that Prince*, and by one of that King's Biſhops. He ſays *he thinks it was by the ſame Man, and by the ſame Hands, whereby* Harding *himſelf was made Prieſt in that* King's *time:* But as his Adverſary tells him this was a Miſtake, ſo he could not charge him with ſaying any more than that he thought ſo, elſe we know with what Language he would have replied upon him. It may be granted that, as *Harding* ſays [q], he never received in King *Edward's* time any higher Order than that of Deacon, and that he was not then ordained by the ſame Perſon who ordained *Jewell* Prieſt: But himſelf confeſſes that he received his Deacon's Orders from one who *took upon him to give Orders* at that time, that is, from one of the Proteſtant Biſhops, and his *Adverſary* as plainly declares that he was made Prieſt by the Impoſition of ſuch Hands; tho' he might be miſtaken in the Perſon.

Harding's *Pretence that* Jewell *had not anſwered his Queſtions, at the ſame time when he is ſetting down the Anſwers he gives to them.*

But he is ſo ridiculous, as to tell him here, that [r] *he had asked him as well of his Biſhoply Vocation, as of his Prieſthood:* As if the Biſhop had anſwered only as to his Prieſthood, when, in the very next Words of his *Defence*, [s] he declares himſelf to be a Biſhop, and affirms firſt, that he came in *by the free and accuſtomed Election of the Chapter*, and then (rejecting his Adverſary's *Tales* of thoſe that had no Orders, *Iſchyras* and *Zacchæus*) ſhews the whole Form and Manner wherein himſelf and his Brethren had received the Epiſcopal Order, by the *Chapter's E-*

[q] Detect. f. 229. b. [r] Detect. f. 230. a. [s] P. 129.

lection,

lection, the Conſecration of the Arch-Biſhop and three Biſhops, and *the Admiſſion of the Prince.* Both his Anſwers, of his Prieſthood, and of his Epiſcopacy, ſtand cloſe together in the *Defence*[t], and muſt have been read by *Harding*, before he repeats them and replies to them in the *Detection*; and could he then have the Face to expreſs himſelf thus, that [v] *Jewell had told but half his Story*; that by *Sacerdos* he meant both *Prieſt and Biſhop*, and *asked him not only of his Prieſthood, but of his Biſhoply Vocation and Miſſion?* Did not his Adverſary firſt name both his Queſtions, *Whether he was a Prieſt, or no?* and, *Whether he was a Biſhop, or no?* and, By *what Hand*, and by *what Order* he was made both Prieſt and Biſhop? And does he not give a direct Anſwer to theſe Queſtions? But his Buſineſs was confidently to out-face his Adverſary, as well as to make a Shew to his own Party, that his Queſtions were *unanſwered*, tho' the plain Anſwers to them lay before him. It is this that ſerves him for a Pretence to be ſo impertinent as to preſent a third time to the Reader's View every Word of thoſe Queſtions (the *hard Queſtions* of which he was ſo well conceited) after he had put them to *Jewell* at firſt in his *Confutation*, and repeated the whole of them in the Beginning of this fourth Book of his *Detection.* He aſks [x] *his Leave to put him in mind of them once again. Thus*, he ſays, *I ſaid, and you have not yet anſwered me, &c.* Not yet anſwered him? Had he not read *Jewell*'s Anſwer in the *Defence?* Yes, he had, and ſets down the whole of it in the *Detection*, in ſuch Order as he thinks fit, and had juſt now come in courſe to give the Reader the Words of his *Adverſary*'s Anſwer to his Queſtion about his Prieſthood, in the Page before that where he tells him that this and the reſt of his Queſtions were

[t] P. 129. [v] Detect. f. 229. b. f. 230. a. [x] Ibid.

yet

yet unanſwered, and repeats them all again to *put his* Reſpondent *in mind of them.* Let the Reader then, if he pleaſes, ſee what the Queſtion is about *Jewell*'s Prieſthood, in the *Detection*, and what Anſwer is ſet down there as given to it: And the like of the Queſtions about his having the Epiſcopal Order, and his Anſwer. The firſt Queſtion implies a Denial of his ever having been made Prieſt, becauſe he could not have *the Inſtitution of a Prieſt* but from *a Biſhop.* The Anſwer is, that he was a Prieſt, and that he was ordained to the Prieſthood by a Biſhop in King *Edward*'s time, the ſame (as he thought) who ordained *Harding* Prieſt; ſuch an one as I have ſhewed *Harding* confeſſes that he at that time looked upon to be qualified to give him the Order of Deacon, tho' in the next Reign he was, or is willing we ſhould believe that he was, otherwiſe perſuaded. The other Queſtions likewiſe imply a Denial of *Jewell*'s having been conſecrated Biſhop, becauſe he could not, *according to the Canons, be conſecrated but by three Biſhops, with the Metropolitan's Conſent.* The Anſwer is, that he and his Brethren were conſecrated in that *Form and Order*, by an *Arch-Biſhop and three other Biſhops.* Were theſe Queſtions then *yet unanſwered*, when *Harding* comes to ſet down himſelf the plain, poſitive, and direct Anſwers which his *Adverſary* had given to them? But he may explain himſelf in the next Page after he has repeated his Queſtions, [y] *Theſe being my Queſtions, you anſwer neither by what Example Hands were laid on you, nor who ſent you, &c.* Is not this ſtrange from one that had juſt before recited *Jewell*'s Declaration, *by whom and after what Example he was ſent and had Hands laid upon him*; that he was *made Prieſt* by a Biſhop in King *Edward*'s *time*, and *by the Order and Ordinance* eſta-

[y] F. 230. b.

bliſhed in his Reign, that is, by the Form in his Ordinal? And one that does recite ſoon after the like Declaration, by whom and by what Example he had Impoſition of Hands, and his Miſſion to the Epiſcopal Order; That he was *made in Form and Order by the Conſecration of an Arch-Biſhop and three other Biſhops?* Does not this ſhew that *Harding* would not ſee what he could not avoid ſeeing if his Eyes were open? Had he elſewhere in the *Confutation* offered Arguments to make good his Charge againſt his Adverſary, that he had no true Biſhops for his Conſecrators, *&c.?* If he had, then there might have been Matter of Complaint that theſe Arguments were *yet unanſwered* by *Jewell* in the *Defence*; if he had not, and the reſt that he ſaid had been anſwered, there was no room left for him to pretend that he had yet received no Anſwer.

Jewell not obliged to prove that his Conſecrators were true Biſhops, except Harding *had firſt offered to prove the contrary.*

11. Should then *Jewell* have done this for him, and have ſtudied to find out what *Harding* might probably have to ſay farther in Proof of his Charge, and have firſt brought theſe Proofs againſt himſelf, in Behalf of his *Adverſary*, and then have tried to give them the beſt Anſwer he could? This is a Taſk that *Le Quien* thinks it very reaſonable that *Jewell* ſhould have impoſed upon himſelf, and upon that Ground rejects what is ſaid by Arch-Biſhop *Bramhall*, [w] *Biſhop* Jewell *was the Defendant, and the Burthen of the Proof did not reſt upon him. This*, [x] ſays the *Father*, *is very ingenious, but it is no more than Shift and Evaſion.* Let us ſee therefore how it appears, that what the *Father* ſays is not only *ingenious*, but *fair* and *rational*, but what *Bramhall* ſays is *ſhifting* and *ſhuffling*.

The Author of the *Treatiſe of Catholick Faith and Hereſy* had ſaid that *Jewell anſwers* his Adverſary

[w] Op. p. 472. [x] T. 1. p. 306.
[y] Treatiſe of Catholick Faith and Hereſy, p. 15.

with

with profound Silence; tho' his Conſcience forces him to ſay preſently, *Only he ſays without any Proof that their Biſhops are made by Form and Order, by the Conſecration of an Arch-Biſhop and three Biſhops, and by the Admiſſion of the Prince.* Biſhop *Bramhall* here convicts this Author from his own Mouth, *I expected*, ſays he, *profound Silence, but I find a profound Anſwer; this is the firſt time I learned how a Man can keep profound Silence and anſwer ſo pertinently all at once.* F. *Le Quien* comes in to the Author's Aſſiſtance, and begins[z], Bramhall *agrees* (with the Writer he anſwers) *about this Silence, and ſays, this is the firſt time* (ſo *Le Quien* goes on) *that I learned how a Man could anſwer poſitively to what is objected, by keeping Silence.* Can the *Father* give himſelf leave to ſay here, that *Bramhall* confeſſes *Jewell*'s Silence, when he ſays he finds no ſuch Silence, but *a pertinent and profound Anſwer?* The Biſhop goes on to aſk, *How does* Harding *go about to take away this Anſwer? for Biſhop* Jewell *was the* Defendant, *and the Burthen of the Proof did not reſt upon him.* Here *Le Quien* takes upon him to be the Biſhop's Maſter in *Logick*, and tells him this is *but an Evaſion*; *it being*, as he ſays, *what is done every Day in regular Diſputes, for the Reſpondent to find himſelf obliged to bring Proofs to ſupport his Anſwers, eſpecially when called upon to do it by his Adverſary.*

Let us conſider whether *Jewell* muſt find himſelf to be thus obliged to make farther Proof in the *Defence*, to ſupport his Anſwers. *Harding* had drawn up a Charge againſt him and the reſt of our Biſhops, of theſe Defects in their Conſecrations, the Want of Conſecrators who had the Epiſcopal Order, and of the Canonical Number of them; the Want of the Metropolitan's Conſent, and of the Biſhop of *Rome*'s Confirmation. He

[z] T. 1. p. 306.

anſwers; for the Confirmation of that Biſhop, there was no Occaſion, the Canons of the Church did not require it, as he proves from the Council [a] of *Nice*, and the Practice of the Church of *Conſtantinople:* For the reſt he anſwers, Our Biſhops were ſo conſecrated, by ſuch as had the Epiſcopal Order, *an Arch-Biſhop and three other Biſhops.* Should *Jewell* have gone farther, and made Proof that this Arch-Biſhop and three Biſhops truly had the Epiſcopal Order? This ſeems to be the *Burthen of Proof* that, by what *Le Quien* ſays, muſt reſt upon him that was the *Defendant.* And how ſhould he prove it? The *Father* ſays, by the *Regiſter* and the *Names* of the Conſecrators. Would this then have been ſufficient, as he affirms over and over? Then the Regiſter with their Names for the Conſecrators, and their Titles, would have been enough to ſatisfy his Adverſary that theſe Conſecrators were not only Biſhops in Name and Title, but really had the Epiſcopal Order and Character. The *Father*, I hope, may now be ſatisfied, that this is very weak reaſoning. But then, it may be ſaid, *Jewell* ſhould in ſome other manner have made it out, that they were, what they pretended to be, true Biſhops. His way for this muſt have been, to bethink himſelf of what had been ſaid, or might probably be ſaid by an *Opponent* on the other ſide, and then to anſwer ſuch Objections as he knew of, or could foreſee. What *had actually* been objected, he could not well know, except *Harding* in his *Confutation* had thought fit to make good his Charge by ſuch Arguments; for the Controverſy about our Orders was at that time new and freſh, and himſelf and his Adverſary two of the firſt that were engaged in it. And for what *might* be objected, he could not be very certain neither: And beſides, in

[a] Sup. p. 417.

making

making ſuch Objections againſt himſelf for his *Adverſary*, who he knew very well was ready to reply upon him as ſoon as he had made an End of his *Defence*, and could not fail of bringing all Arguments againſt him that he thought to be of any Weight; the *Reſpondent Jewell* in this Caſe, by foreſtalling his Adverſary, would (if *Le Quien* will give me leave to know any thing of the Rules of Diſpute) have againſt Rule changed his Place, and invaded that of the *Opponent*; and if it had been in a regular Diſputation, he that preſided would have told him that was not his Province, but ought to be left to another that was ready to come up after him. This may be ſaid as to the *Father*'s Laws of diſputing: But it ought to be conſidered beſides, what an unthankful Office it is that he would put the Biſhop upon to ſatisfy his *Adverſary*. If it had been done as he requires, what Return would he have had from the haughty Opponent? We ſee how he would have begun with him. "[b] You tell not half of my Tale, which I ſhould "have told you, if you had left it to my ſelf. "Theſe Arguments are your own, and not mine; "'tis eaſy for you to ſet up a Man of Straw, and "then to conquer him; but I have Arguments "againſt you *to which I am ſure neither you nor "your Fellows can give any juſt and right Anſwer.*" Let the *Father* now ſee, if he pleaſes, whether *Jewell*, by the Laws of Diſpute, (ſuch as he ſays are *put in Practice every Day*) ought to have laid himſelf open to ſuch a Reply.

12. We were apt to look upon *Jewell*'s Words, "Our Biſhops are made in Form and Order—— "by free Election of the Chapter, by Conſecra- "tion of the Arch-Biſhop and three other Biſhops, "and the Admiſſion of the Prince," as a pertinent

LeQuien's *and* Fitzherbert's *Reflections upon* Jewell's *Words*, Our Biſhops are made, &c.

[b] Detect. f. 229. b.

as if he meant other Biſhops, and not himſelf.

nent and ſufficient Anſwer to *Harding*'s Queſtion, *How and by whom* he was *called* to the Epiſcopal Order. But *Fitzherbert*, and *Le Quien* after him, diſcover in the very firſt Words, *Our Biſhops*, a ſcandalous Piece of Trick and Artifice, wherein the Proteſtant Prelate attempts to put a Cheat upon his Readers. "You ſee (ſays *Fitzherbert* [c]) he "ſays not, *I was made*, or *We were made*, by the "Conſecration of an Arch-Biſhop and three Bi-"ſhops, as he ſhould have ſaid, but *Our Biſhops* "*are made, &c.*" *Le Quien*'s Words [d] are, *Il eſt bon de remarquer le detour*; that is, *It is good to obſerve the ſly and cunning Evaſion of this Anſwer— He does not ſay plainly in what Manner he himſelf was conſecrated, which was the Queſtion*; that is, he ſays not, *I was made in Form and Order, &c.* but *Our Biſhops are made in Form and Order.* And both of them tell us that he ſpeaks of the Way of making Biſhops at the time (not when he was conſecrated but) when he writ his *Defence*; that is, as *Le Quien* ſays, *after the Convocation*, 1562. *Jewell* was an artful Man, if he made uſe of this Way of impoſing upon his *Adverſary* and the Readers. But muſt not *Fitzherbert* and *Le Quien* wonder in themſelves how *Harding*, ſo quick-ſighted and captious an Antagoniſt, ſhould come not to take the leaſt Notice of this *Equivocation* of the Biſhop's, which lay ſo plainly to be diſcovered at the firſt Sight of his Words? It was, becauſe *Harding* was not ſo much in haſte to reſolve how to chaſtiſe the *Hypocrite* (as he would have called him) till he had firſt looked a little farther, and by that means was prevented, when he came, at a little diſtance, to find him expreſſing himſelf in this manner: "[e] *We ſucceed the Biſhops that have been before our Days; we are elect-*

[c] See his Adjoinder in the Remarker. p. 102.
[d] T. 1. p. 297. [e] Def. p. 132. Detect. f. 245. b.

ed, conſecrated, confirmed, and admitted as they were. *We*, I hope, is enough for *Fitzherbert*, and will be allowed by *Le Quien* to mean the ſame as *Our Biſhops*, and not (here at leaſt) to exclude the *Speaker* himſelf, as if he were not Succeſſor to Biſhop *Capon*, *&c.* in the See of *Salisbury*, as the other Biſhops ſucceeded their Predeceſſors in their reſpective Sees; or as if he alone was not elected and conſecrated in the ſame Form and Manner as the reſt. They might have ſeen the ſame thing again in *Jewell*'s Additions to his *Defence*, "[f] *We* "deny not the Conſecration of three Biſhops: "*We* deny not the Confirmation of the Metro- "politan: *We ourſelves* are ſo conſecrated, and ſo "confirmed." Muſt *We*, here, and *We ourſelves*, be excluſive of the Perſon that ſpeaks? Muſt the Meaning be of *other* Biſhops, and not of *Jewell?* then there might be Reaſon for thoſe Words, *Our Biſhops are made in Form and Order*, to be underſtood in like manner not of him but other Biſhops; but otherwiſe, by *Fitzherbert*'s own Confeſſion, he and *Le Quien* might have avoided the Diſcredit of their too haſty and unjuſt Reflection, if they could but have had the Patience to read a little farther in *Jewell* or *Harding*, where they would have found *Jewell* ſaying more than once, *We were ſo made*; *We are ſo conſecrated.*

But *Harding* perhaps paſſed this over, becauſe he made no Reply at all to theſe Words. Yes, he makes a double Reply, Firſt he aſks, *What Form and Order mean you?* His Exception is, that this Form was without the Proteſtant Biſhops ſending communicatory Letters to all other Biſhops out of *England*, or to the Pope inſtead of them, for his Confirmation: But could he avoid aſking farther, "Do "you mean the Form and Order of your Conſe- "cration at the *Nag's-Head?*" Or rather, could

[f] P. 125. ſup. p. 419.

he avoid ſpeaking more like himſelf? "*This is* "another *impudent Lye*, *Mr.* Jewell: *Was there* "*ever Man more impudent than you are*, to ſay "that *you and your Fellows were made in Form and* "*Order*, *by the Conſecration of an Arch-Biſhop and* "*three other Biſhops*, when that Arch-Biſhop of "yours, and your ſelf, and the reſt of your firſt "Biſhops, were conſecrated all at the ſame time "together by one of our Apoſtate Prieſts, with-"out either ours, or even your own, Form and "Order of Conſecration, and without any Reli-"gious Solemnity, not in any Church or Chapel, "but in a Tavern?" If *Harding* could be mute here, notwithſtanding his being very early and fully acquainted with the whole Story, he deſerved to be told that he muſt for ever hold his Peace: And this ſhould be enough to ſtop their Mouths who pretend to make him an *Evidence* for it.

Harding's *Reply about the Arch-Biſhop's Conſecration.*

But he makes full Amends (they will ſay) for this Omiſſion, in the latter part of his Reply, where he ſhews the Biſhop, how unhappy he was in ſaying he and his Brethren were conſecrated by an *Arch-Biſhop*; and thereby giving him an Occaſion to turn upon him with a Queſtion of much worſe Conſequence; "How, I pray you, was "your Arch-Biſhop himſelf conſecrated? What "three Biſhops in the Realm were there to lay "Hands upon him?" Theſe, and the Words that follow, are plain Demonſtration, in the Judgment of our Adverſaries, that the Author's Meaning was that our firſt Arch-Biſhop, *Parker*, never had that Conſecration, which we report that he had from the *Lambeth* Regiſter, nor in fact any Ordination at all, except that ſcandalous Mock-Conſecration at the Tavern. So the Doctor of the *Sorbonne* leads them the Way, and is followed by the Writer of the *Nullity*, in his firſt *Treatiſe of*

[g] Detect. f. 234. b.

Faith

Faith and Hereſy, and both of them by *Ward* the Poet, F. *Le Quien*, and the *Remarker*. But let us ſee what Grounds they have in this Place from the Author himſelf. His next Words are, "You "have now uttered a worſe Caſe for your ſelves "than was by me before named." Here I muſt confeſs, that any one that had heard the Noiſe which they make of the *Nag's-Head* Ordination, might at firſt be under ſome Expectation or Apprehenſions what this *worſe Caſe* would come to, and be apt to think that now *all the Murder* (as we uſe to ſay) *was like to come out*, and nothing elſe would preſently follow but that Piece of Hiſtory. But when he proceeds to the reſt that the Author ſays here, how would the Expectations of the *Romaniſt*, and the Apprehenſions of the Proteſtant ſink to nothing? What follows is, "[h] Your Me-"tropolitan, who ſhould give Authority to all "your Conſecrations, himſelf had *no lawful Con-"ſecration*. If you had been conſecrated after "the Form and Order which hath *ever been uſed*, "you might have had Biſhops out of *France* to "have conſecrated you, in caſe there had lacked "in *England*. But now there were *ancient* Biſhops "enough in *England*, who either were not re-"quired, or *refuſed* to conſecrate you: Which is "an evident ſign that ye ſought not ſuch a Con-"ſecration as had ever been uſed, but ſuch an "one whereof all the former Biſhops were "*aſhamed*." Let us now conſider what Uſe our Adverſaries can make of this Teſtimony of *Harding*'s, either to diſprove the Fact of *Parker*'s Conſecration at *Lambeth*, or to prove his having no Conſecration but at the *Nag's-Head*.

His Reply no Proof that Parker *was not conſecrated at* Lambeth,

Jewell, he ſays, by owning they were conſecrated by an Arch-Biſhop, *utters a worſe Caſe for themſelves than had been named by him before.* And how

[h] Ibid.

nor that he was ordained at the Nag's-Head.

how was it a worſe Caſe? becauſe the Arch-Biſhop himſelf *had not* (as he ſays) *a lawful Conſecration.* He *had named it before*, and declared their Caſe to be bad in regard to *Jewell* and his Fellows, that they were not lawfully conſecrated; but it muſt be *worſe* if the Metropolitan himſelf had no lawful Conſecration; becauſe his being not lawfully conſecrated muſt derive a Want of lawful Confirmation and Conſecration upon all the Biſhops afterwards confirmed and conſecrated by him, or by his Conſent and Authority. This is all wherein their Caſe is made worſe; and can then its being made worſe, neceſſarily imply that the Metropolitan not only was not, in *Harding*'s Opinion, *lawfully conſecrated*, but had no Conſecration at all, or that he was conſecrated not at *Lambeth*, but at the *Nag's-Head?*

He denies *Parker* to have had *a lawful Conſecration*; and his Ground for it is in the Words foregoing, that there were not *three Biſhops in the Realm to lay Hands upon him.* Can it be a good Inference from this, that he denies *Barlow*, *Scory*, *Coverdale* and *Hodgskins*, to have been in the Realm at that time, or to have laid their Hands upon *Parker?* Yes, it muſt certainly follow, if he does believe and allow that thoſe four Perſons were *true* and *lawful* Biſhops; then his Words muſt imply a Denial that theſe four Biſhops, or any one or more of them were *Parker*'s Conſecrators, but they muſt have been either out of the Realm, or not preſent at his Conſecration. But does he not expreſly deny that the Proteſtants had any true or lawful Biſhops *in their Sect*, by what Names or Titles ſoever any of their *New Miniſters* might be dignified? If he does, then he denies thoſe four of the Sect to be true and lawful Biſhops, and conſequently he might, notwithſtanding that Denial that *Parker* had three Biſhops to lay Hands upon him, own and confeſs that all theſe four Perſons

ſons took upon them to give him in fact Impoſition of Hands. So we ſee that in this Place, as well as in ſo many others wherein it has been demonſtrated before, he may be looked upon to deny that *Parker* was *lawfully* and *validly* conſecrated, but it cannot with any Reaſon be pretended that he denies his having been at all conſecrated *in fact*.

It is the like as to the Words following, where he charges them with their making choice of ſuch a *Form and Order* of Conſecration, or in general of being made Biſhops (ſo the *Remarker*[i] contends the Words ought to be underſtood) as no Catholick Biſhops here or in *France* could have approved of, ſuch as obliged their Biſhops here, if any of them were *required* to conſecrate ours, to *refuſe* it. Can this be made an Argument to prove, that they had no Order or Form *at all* whereby they were made (but took Poſſeſſion of their Biſhopricks and Functions, without any more ado, by vertue only of the *Queen's Letters Patents*) when the Author ſays expreſly that they *ſought*, that is, made choice of ſome certain Form and Order? Or that they did not *ſeek* and make choice of that Form and Order in particular whereby we report, from the publick Records and Regiſters, that they were made? the Election of the Chapters upon the Queen's Letters Miſſive; the Confirmation of the Metropolitan, or of four Biſhops; and the Conſecration by four Biſhops (without an Arch-Biſhop) or by an Arch-Biſhop, with two or three, or more, Biſhops joining with him, according to the *Stat.* 25 *H.* VIII.; and by the Form of conſecrating Biſhops appointed in King *Edward*'s Ordinal? If this be ſuch an Order of making Biſhops as the Biſhops of their Communion would have *refuſed*, (for want of the Pope's Confirmation to

[i] P. 65.

give

give them Authority to conſecrate the Biſhops, for want of the Form and Ceremonies in the *Roman* Pontifical, and of the Oath to the Pope's Supremacy, inſtead of the contrary Oath to the Queen's, beſides what Objections they might have had againſt the Religion of the Perſons to be conſecrated) if they muſt, agreeably to their Principles, have refuſed to act a Part in the Conſecration of Biſhops made in that Form and Order; can then his ſaying that it was ſuch a Form and Order as they would have *refuſed* to bear a Part in, neceſſarily imply that it muſt be his Meaning to deny that thoſe Biſhops of ours were made in ſuch Form and Order?

He ſays likewiſe *they ſought ſuch a Conſecration whereof all the former Biſhops were aſhamed.* Aſhamed, either to bear a Part in ſuch a kind of Conſecration themſelves, or to think or hear of ſuch a Conſecration acted by the Proteſtants. And might not the Conſecration according to King *Edward*'s Ordinal be ſuch an one in *Harding*'s Opinion? No, *Le Quien* tells us, *Harding*'s Expreſſion [k] implies *ſomething more ſhameful and ridiculous*, and *more ſuitable to the Conſecration at the Tavern*, than to that by King *Edward*'s *New Ritual.* Would not then their Biſhops have looked upon it as a *ſhameful* Conſecration, to lay Hands upon our Biſhops without the Pope's Leave and Authority, to lay aſide the Pomp and Solemnity of the Ceremonies in their Pontifical eſtabliſhed by the Authority of their Church, and to tender to the Perſons conſecrated the Oath of the Queen's, and Abjuration of the Pope's, Supremacy, for Refuſal of which themſelves had been deprived of their Biſhopricks? Would they not have been aſhamed of ſuch a Conſecration by the Proteſtants, and much more to have performed it themſelves?

[k] T. 1. p. 299.

ſelves? If they would, then how can the Author's ſaying they were aſhamed of it, be a Proof that he could not mean a Conſecration by King *Edward*'s Ritual?

But the *Father* enforces this Argument by another Reaſoning of the like Subtlety and Acuteneſs[l]. It muſt be *ſomething extraordinary*, beyond King *Edward*'s Ceremonial, that gave *Harding* Occaſion to put that Queſtion to *Jewell*, *After what Example* were you conſecrated? How willing is he to catch at every Trifle that may bear the leaſt Colour of an Argument? Does not the Author himſelf tell us, that he put this Queſtion to himſelf, [m] *After what Example* he was ordained Deacon in King *Edward*'s time? And what Anſwer does he make to it? Is it that one of the Biſhops in that Reign ordained him (*after the Example* of one of their Popes) in a *Stable* or an *Inn?* Or does he not ſay that the Order was adminiſtred to him by the [n] Form and Manner preſcribed in the Ordinal of that King? So we ſee what a very extraordinary Concluſion is the Fruit of *Le Quien*'s Labour and Study to find out any thing that may give Countenance to the ſhameful and ridiculous Fable, for which he is pleaſed to be an Advocate.

But could he not have ſeen, on the other Side, that the very Way that the Author takes of expreſſing himſelf upon this Occaſion, is a manifeſt Proof that he never was apprized of the Fact of the *Nag's-Head* Ordination? For if he had been, could he diſcover ſo much of Temper and Indifference, as to ſay no more of *Parker*'s and *Jewell*'s entring upon their Epiſcopal Functions, by ſuch an Act of Sacrilege and Profaneneſs, than that they *had no lawful Conſecration*, that there were *not three Biſhops in the Realm to lay Hands upon them?* that they choſe not to be *conſecrated after*

[l] Ibid. [m] Detect. f. 230. [n] Ib. f. 231. a.

the Form and Order which had ever been uſed; that is, as he meant, by the *Roman* Pontifical? but *ſought ſuch a Conſecration whereof all the former Biſhops were aſhamed?* Aſhamed! Sure *Harding* muſt believe theſe Biſhops, *Bonner*, *White*, *Watſon*, *&c.* to be Men of a very meek Spirit, and to have had very little Zeal for the Honour of God and Religion, the Inſtitutions of Chriſt and his Apoſtles, and the Canons of the Church; and as little Concern for the Reſpect they knew was due to their own Sacrament of Orders, to Conſecrated Places, and the Religious Ceremonies appropriated to the Adminiſtration of that Sacrament, and the Offices of Divine Worſhip in the Church and at the Altar, always uſed at thoſe Solemnities. Could he otherwiſe think that theſe Biſhops ſhould be no more than *aſhamed*, at ſuch a daring Contempt and Violation of all that is Sacred, at which every Chriſtian, that underſtood and valued his Religion, muſt be filled with *Horror and Deteſtation?* Let us conſider farther, that the Perſon with whom *Harding* is engaged, is ſuppoſed to be one who, together with his Metropolitan, *&c.* was conſecrated in this manner, and muſt know in his Conſcience, at the time when he was defending his Orders, that he had no other Conſecration, and yet was ſo hardned, as, inſtead of ſhuffling off the Matter under the Cover of *profound Silence*, to declare poſitively, in the Preſence of God, and before his Adverſary and all the World, that he and the reſt were conſecrated in the Church's *uſual Form and Order*, *by an Arch-Biſhop and three other Biſhops.* Could *Harding* forbear to reprove him, for ſuch a Falſhood uttered againſt his own Conſcience, (not in the Way too natural to him, *You lye*; *You are an impudent Lyar*, but) in the Words of Truth and Soberneſs, "O Man *full of Subtlety and Miſchief*, you "*Child of the Devil, and Enemy of Righteouſneſs*;

"you

" you *know the Wickedneſs that your Heart was*
" *privy to*, when you and your Fellows took up-
" on you to ordain one another at the Tavern.
" And can you have the Face to pretend, that
" this Mock-Conſecration was in due *Form and*
" *Order, by an Arch-Biſhop and three other Biſhops?*"
This, or ſomething more harſh and bitter, muſt have been *Harding*'s Reply, if he had had ſuch a Conſecration to have objected to his Adverſary: But his laying no more either to his or *Parker*'s Charge, but their Want of *a lawful Conſecration by three Biſhops*, that they would not be conſecrated by the *Form that had ever been uſed*, but ſuch a Form as their Biſhops either had or would have *refuſed* to conſecrate them by, ſuch a Form as *they all were aſhamed of:* His making no more of it, after he gives us Expectations of *the Caſe* being made ſo much *worſe*, is a manifeſt Proof that he was a Stranger to the whole Tranſaction which was afterwards invented and publiſhed to the World in that ſcandalous Story.

The Reader ſees what is the Reſult of this Objection which is made by *Harding* againſt the Metropolitan *Parker*'s Conſecration, which our Adverſaries have the Confidence notwithſtanding to cry up as plainly carrying the Cauſe both againſt *Parker* and *Jewell*, and not being capable to be underſtood of any thing leſs than his charging them with their being ordained at the *Nag's-Head*. 'Tis with this Regard that *Champney* [o] calls it *a moſt ſharp Reply*; and his Words are repeated in the *Treatiſe of Faith and Hereſy* [p]; and *Le Quien* ſays he *preſſes* his Adverſary [q] *plus vivement*, that is, charges him more *briſkly*, and ſtrikes home, and touches *Jewell* to the quick. A very *brisk* Charge indeed (if *Harding* had that Meaning which they pretend) inſtead of arraigning them

[o] De Vocat. Miniſtr. p. 467. [p] P. 16. [q] T. 1. p. 297.

for

for an Act ſo very ſcandalous and profane, to ſay no more than that they had *no lawful Conſecration*; and inſtead of ſaying it was a Conſecration that every Chriſtian Biſhop in the World muſt ſtand amazed at with the greateſt Abhorrence and Deteſtation, to ſay it was ſuch a Conſecration as ſome of their Biſhops did *refuſe* to bear a Part in, and *whereof they all were aſhamed.* Juſt as if a Man were guilty of Wilful Murther, and his Proſecutor ſhould indict him for no more than an *Aſſault and Battery* upon the Perſon whom he had *murthered*; or another ſhould have committed a Robbery upon the *Highway*, or been guilty of *Burglary*, and the Indictment ſhould run only for *petty Larceny.* Or (if I may go a little out of the way for a Compariſon) it is as if the meek and pleaſant Mr. *Mede* had brought his Actions againſt the *Hooker*, who twice attempted to draw off his Bedclothes from him, as he lay in his Bed with the Windows open to the Street; and the firſt Action (according to the pleaſant Rebuke which he gave to the Rogue) ſhould be for not having the Patience [r] *to ſtay till he was aſleep*; and the other, for his *putting him in danger of taking Cold.*

Jewell's *making no Rejoinder to* Harding's *Reply of no Service to our Adverſaries.*

13. But *Jewell*'s [f] making no Rejoinder to this Part of *Harding*'s Reply about *Parker*'s Want of Conſecration, as he does to the former Part, of our Biſhops not obſerving what he calls the *Old Form*, in giving Notice to the Biſhop of *Rome*, for his *Confirmation:* His being ſilent in this Particular, is the Ground whereupon they have the Confidence to tell us, that this Part of *Harding*'s *ſharp Reply* ſtruck his Adverſary quite dumb, and left him not a Word to ſay in Vindication of the Orders of his Metropolitan; but inſtead of that,

[r] Append. to his Life, firſt Vol. of his Works. p. lxxiii.
[f] Defence of the Apology, p. 129. Detect. fol. 234. b. Defence, ibid.

obliged

obliged him to paſs it over, and diſſemble the Matter, as if there had been no ſuch Objection made by *Harding*. But I would aſk, Does *Jewell* give an Anſwer to every Particular in *Harding*'s Reply to him in the *Detection*, and leave none but this untouched? If ſo, then there muſt be ſomething more than ordinary that occaſioned his being ſilent upon this Head: But if not, may not this be one of thoſe many Places in the *Detection*, which *Jewell* makes no Anſwer to, but lets his Adverſary have the laſt Word, for no other Reaſon but that he ſaw, either that they did not deſerve, or that they did not require, an Anſwer? I have had Occaſion a little before [t], to ſhew the Reader ſome ſuch Places in the Great Dr. *Harding*, wherein he is ſo very trifling and impertinent, that he is obliged to the Biſhop for not expoſing him, but deſerves no Anſwer, except it be to let his Admirers ſee, if they pleaſe, what a Writer he is, very vain and full of himſelf, but as weak and irrational in point of Argument. But what Anſwer is it that *Jewell* ſhould have returned to this Objection before us againſt *Parker*'s Ordination, for want of which it is ſo confidently pronounced that he has utterly given up his own and the Arch-Biſhop's Orders as impoſſible to be defended? They are ready to tell us that he ought to have made Proof of the Fact of *Parker*'s Ordination, and to have produced the Act of his Conſecration from the *Lambeth* Regiſter. But if *Harding* never intended to deny the Fact, but only the Validity and Lawfulneſs of the Ordinations, what Occaſion had *Jewell* to prove that they were true in fact? and that he had no ſuch Intention has been, I hope, ſufficiently proved from his own Words in other Places, as well as it has been ſhewed that this Place, of *Parker*'s Ordination, does not require

[t] Sup. p. 424, 425, 429.

that it ſhould be interpreted in any other Senſe. It would therefore have been to no purpoſe for *Jewell* to have ſhewed him that there *were in the Realm three*, and more than double that Number, of *Proteſtant Biſhops*, to have laid their Hands upon Arch-Biſhop *Parker*. This could not have ſatisfied his Adverſary, the Meaning of whoſe Queſtion was not, What three or more ſuch as he took to be only *Nominal* or *Pretended* Biſhops, or Biſhops who had *apoſtatized* from their Church, but What three true and lawful Biſhops (ſuch three Biſhops as the Canons of the Church require) were in the Realm to lay Hands upon him: So that tho' he had named to *Harding* all the ſeven Biſhops who were in Queen *Elizabeth*'s Commiſſion of *December* 6. to confirm and conſecrate *Parker*, yet that Objection would have held good againſt his having had a lawful Conſecration, tho' he had been conſecrated Arch-Biſhop by the laying on of all their Hands.

If *Harding* had meant that there were not three Proteſtant Biſhops in the Realm, *Jewell* could eaſily have proved from his own Confeſſion, that he could not but know the contrary. He had owned [v], five or ſix Pages before, that there were Proteſtant Biſhops in King *Edward*'s time who *took upon them to give Holy Orders*, one of whom gave him the Order of Deacon, and another ordained *Jewell* Prieſt. And could he then be ignorant that of thoſe Biſhops, ſome, as *Hodgskins* and the other *Suffragan* named in Queen *Elizabeth*'s Mandate of *December* 6. continued here in *England*, and eſcaped the Fury of the Perſecution in the next Reign; and others, as *Barlow*, *Scory*, *Coverdale*, and *Bale*, ſaved themſelves by flying into foreign Parts, from whence they ſoon returned home after Queen *Elizabeth*'s Acceſſion

[v] Deteſt. f. 230, 231.

to the Throne? His *Detection* was printed *A.* 1568. and had he not heard in all that time what paſſed very early in the Year 1559? Did he not know there was a Conference between ſome of their Biſhops and Clergy and the Proteſtants, the laſt of *March* and ſecond of *April* that Year, the Iſſue of which muſt give an Alarm to the whole Party, when *two Biſhops* of the Diſputants of their Side were ſent to the *Tower* for their Inſolence in breaking off the Diſputation? Had he not the Curioſity to know the Names of the Perſons that were to diſpute of each Side, one whereof, that appeared for the Proteſtants, was a Biſhop[w] of King *Edward*'s newly returned? Could he be ignorant, or muſt he not have heard with the greateſt Regret and Mortification, That ſome of thoſe Perſons appeared bare-faced in the Courſe of that Year, in the moſt publick Places in *London*, and upon the moſt ſolemn Occaſions[x], to preach at Court before the Queen, or at St. *Paul*'s Croſs before ſo numerous an Audience as uſed to attend thoſe Sermons; and to bear a Part, by the Queen's Appointment, in the Solemnity of performing the *Obſequies* of the *French* King? Theſe Paſſages were ſo publick and notorious, that they could not eſcape the Knowledge of all Perſons of each Side who were concerned to obſerve what paſſed, upon either their Hopes or Fears of an enſuing Alteration of Religion, contrary to that which had been eſtabliſhed in the former Reign: And if *Harding* knew nothing of their being then in *England*, or could have the Face to deny it, he muſt not be reckoned one of thoſe Catholicks that *Le Quien* ſpeaks of[y], *who were intent to obſerve daily all the Steps that were taken by the New Paſtors*, or he muſt be looked upon as a Diſſembler of what

[w] Strype's Annals, Vol. 1. p. 89. [x] Strype, ibid. p. 42, 128, 133, 135, 136, 137. [y] T. 1. p. 232.

he well knew to be fact. Beſides, in this very Part of his Reply he ſpeaks as if ſome of their *ancient Biſhops were required to conſecrate* Parker, *but refuſed:* And what could be his Ground for this, but that he knew of Queen *Elizabeth*'s [z] Mandate of *Septemb.* 9. to ſix Biſhops, *Tonſtall* of *Durham*, *Bourne* of *Bath and Wells*, and *Pole* of *Peterborough*, (three of the Popiſh Biſhops not yet deprived) with *Kitchin* of *Landaff*, and *Barlow*, and *Scory*, to confirm and conſecrate *Parker* Arch-Biſhop of *Canterbury?* He may well be ſuppoſed to mean the *three firſt*, by the Perſons who were *required* by the Queen's Mandate, but *refuſed* to pay Obedience to it by joining with the other three in that Confirmation and Conſecration: But then he could not be ignorant of *Barlow*'s and *Scory*'s being in the Realm, to be put in the ſame Commiſſion with the other four. And this Commiſſion not being executed, by the Default of thoſe *Refuſers*, muſt give him Occaſion, as he was ſo *intent to obſerve all the Steps of the New Paſtors*, to expect another, and to have Advice of it when it came out in *December* following; and that muſt inform him that [a] there were three other Proteſtant Biſhops, *Bale* of *Oſſory*, and *Hodgskins*, and the other *Suffragan*, who with *Landaff*, *Barlow*, *Scory*, and *Coverdale*, were required, either all, or four of them, to perform the Office. All this *Jewell* had Grounds, from his being in *England* that Year and afterwards, to believe that he was no Stranger to, nor conſequently to *Parker*'s Confirmation at *Bow Church*, and Conſecration at *Lambeth*, by four of theſe Proteſtant Prelates, very ſoon after. And then he could have no Reaſon to think, that *Harding* meant to deny that *Parker* had three Proteſtant Biſhops in *England* to lay Hands upon him, but that he only denied

[z] Strype's Life of Matth. Parker, p. 54. [a] Strype, ib.

that

that there were three ſuch Biſhops as could give him a lawful Conſecration, which he believed none in *England* could do but the *Ancient Popiſh* Biſhops, who, as he ſays, either were not *required* or *refuſed* to do it.

14. *Le Quien* thinks it much for his Purpoſe to ſhew how impoſſible it was for the Catholicks at that time to be ignorant of the Conſecration of *Matthew Parker* and the reſt of our firſt Biſhops, if they were conſecrated by thoſe Perſons, and at the Place and in the Manner, as it is related in our Regiſter. *The Ceremony*, he ſays [b], *according to the Regiſter, was performed by a competent Number of Biſhops in the Chapel of the Arch-Biſhop's Palace at* Lambeth, *in the Suburbs of* London; *it was done publickly before the Eyes of a great Number of Perſons, who were either invited thither*, (he might have added, obliged to be there by their Places and Profeſſions) *or were brought thither upon the Report ſpread throughout the whole Town*, of ſuch Conſecrations being to be celebrated; *in a word*, he ſays, *thoſe Conſecrations were performed at that time in the ſame manner as they are at preſent. The Fact therefore of thoſe Ordinations muſt* (he ſays) *be then and ſome time after better known, more publick, more notorious, than the very Acts of the Conſecrations, which were then drawn up, and entered into the publick Regiſtry, for the Proof of them in After-Times and Ages, at the greateſt Diſtance.* The *Father* ſhews it muſt be ſo, by a parallel Inſtance of the Conſecration of the Arch-Biſhop of *Paris*, the *Cardinal de Noailles*.

Le Quien *furniſhes us with a good Reaſon why* Jewell *muſt think it impertinent to give* Harding *any Proof of the* Fact *of his Ordination.*

Here we are obliged to *Le Quien* for ſuggeſting to us a very good Reaſon, why *Jewell*, if he knew that *Parker* and himſelf, *&c.* were *made in that Form and Order* as he poſitively affirms to *Hard-*

[b] T. 1. p. 247, 248, 307.

ing, could not poſſibly think that his Adverſary was in the leaſt ignorant of thoſe Facts, which were more publick and notorious than the very Acts of their Conſecrations; and if he could not think ſo, then he could not imagine that *Harding* meant to deny thoſe Facts, and that he in Anſwer to him was obliged to make Proof of them: and ſo we could not give a better or more ſatisfactory Account of *Jewell*'s being ſilent in that Particular, and not making himſelf ridiculous, by offering to prove to his Adverſary that which he was certain he muſt know ſo well already. *Harding* was at that time one of the *Catholicks* [b] *who* (as the *Father* ſays) *were either upon the Spot, or could not be ignorant of what paſſed in the Promotion of theſe Biſhops*. He was provoked very early to be upon the watch to obſerve every Step they took, by his being put under Confinement at *Salisbury* [c], by the Commiſſioners ſent down thither to tender the Oath of Supremacy; by the Election of *Jewell* (who was one of them) to that Biſhoprick by the Chapter, wherein he owns [d] that he was deſired to bear a Part, but refuſed; and by his own Deprivation of the Treaſurerſhip of that Church; which yet did not make him reſolve to leave *England*, but he ſtaid here for more than two Years after Queen *Elizabeth*'s Acceſſion to the Throne, before he took his Flight croſs the Seas to *Lovaine*. By Mr. *Strype*'s Account, from a Liſt [e] (in the *Paper Houſe*) given in to the Council by the Eccleſiaſtical Commiſſioners, he was yet in the Realm for part of the Year 1561, and then under no other Reſtraint than to keep within ſixteen Miles of either of the two Places which he had his Choice to reſide in; ſo that he could want no Opportunities of being informed of the publick Tranſ-

[b] Ibid. [c] Detect. fol. 233. b. [d] Detect. f. 233. a.
[e] Annals of Q. Eliz. Vol. 1. p. 240, 241.

actions.

actions. And before the Middle of that Year, not only *Parker*, but almoſt [f] the whole Number of his Suffragans (excepting *Barlow* and *Scory*, who were confirmed only) had been ſolemnly conſecrated at *Lambeth*. The Facts of ſo many Conſecrations could not fail to come to his Knowledge, if he had any Inclination to hear how Affairs were carried on in the New Church: and then he muſt ſee that the Bench of Biſhops was almoſt filled with the Reformers, and that all his Hopes were at an End, if he waited for a Reſtoration of their Old Biſhops to their Epiſcopal Chairs, or of himſelf to his Stall at *Salisbury*; and ſo he might think it time for him then to leave his native Country, and to ſeek for Protection and Subſiſtence Abroad. The Solemnities of theſe Conſecrations *Le Quien* grants, if they were performed as uſual, muſt have brought together a great Number of Perſons that were Eye-Witneſſes of the Ceremony, and the more (I may add) at the firſt Conſecration of the Arch-Biſhop, and the two next Conſecrations, the one of [g] four, and the other of five Biſhops together (where alſo their own Retinue that attended muſt be greater) becauſe to theſe earlieſt Conſecrations a very great Number might reſort, for no other Reaſon perhaps, but to ſee the Difference between the decent Solemnity and Primitive and Apoſtolical Simplicity of the Conſecrations, by Prayer, and Invocation of the Holy Spirit, and Impoſition of Hands, with the Liturgy, Sermon, and Holy Communion, from the theatrical Pomp and Pageantry of the Conſecrations in the late Reign, with the Addition not only of the Unction, but of the Mitre, Paſtoral Staff, Rings, Gloves, Sandals or Slippers, with the Pall to the Arch-Biſhop; which *Parker* thought it to be ſome *Happineſs* that [h] he was the *firſt and ſole Arch-Biſhop*

[f] Strype, ibid. p. 157. [g] Strype, ibid. [h] Strype's Life of Arch-Biſhop Parker, App. p. 151.

of Canterbury, *of all the ſeventy from* Auſtin *the Monk*, whoſe Conſecration was not encumbered and expoſed, rather than adorned, with theſe Ceremonies. Theſe firſt Conſecrations, of ten Biſhops, took up no more time than from *Dec.* 17. 1559. when Arch-Biſhop *Parker* was conſecrated, to *Dec.* the 21ſt following, when the firſt four, and a Month after when the laſt five received their Conſecration; ſo that there was ſufficient Notoriety of the Fact, for any one to be aſſured of, who might be concerned to have Information of thoſe Proceedings. And that theſe, and the Conſecrations of the Biſhops afterwards, to the filling up almoſt of the whole Number, were ſo publick and notorious, that the Church and the Realm were ſatisfied of the Reality of them, it is evident from this, that ſo ſoon after as the Year 1562. theſe very Perſons, without the leaſt Oppoſition made, that we hear of, were allowed and authorized to hold a *Synod*, wherein thoſe Articles of Religion were paſſed which have been the ſtanding Doctrine of the Church of *England* from that time; and at the ſame time, without the leaſt Contradiction or Diſpute in either of the Two Houſes of Parliament, took their Places and acted with full Authority in the Houſe of Peers, and that without ſeeing they had any Occaſion to have a *Bill* brought in at that time, to declare their Ordinations to be true and lawful; as there was afterwards, *Ann.* 1566. upon the *Boldneſs* of the *Party*, encouraged by the Suit depending between *Bonner* and *Horne*. Could *Harding* be, or could *Jewell* ſuppoſe him to be, ignorant of all theſe Paſſages ſo notorious to the whole Nation? not to mention that the *Declaration* of the Parliament 1566. was made no leſs than two Years before he writ his *Detection*. We ſee then what is the Reſult of the Argument from *Jewell*'s Silence; he ſays nothing to *Harding*'s Denial that *Parker* had

had a lawful Conſecration, and that there were three Biſhops to lay Hands upon him; he does not offer to confute his Adverſary by making Proof of the Fact of the Arch-Biſhop's Conſecration at *Lambeth*. The Anſwer is eaſy; *Jewell* knew that nothing could be more notorious than the Conſecration of the Arch-Biſhop, and ſo many Biſhops whom he conſecrated preſently after, at his Chapel at *Lambeth*, with the uſual Solemnities, before ſo great a Number of Witneſſes; he could not therefore underſtand *Harding* as denying a Fact ſo publickly known, and conſequently had no Reaſon to anſwer as if his Words did imply ſuch a Denial.

The Father's Pretence that Harding, and Stapleton muſt be believed to have conteſted the Fact of our Ordinations, or elſe they muſt have been Fools or Madmen to reproach the Biſhops as having not been truly conſecrated.

15. But *Le Quien* will pretend to deny that *Jewell* knew his own and *Parker*'s Ordination were thus publickly ſolemnized at *Lambeth*, upon the ſame Ground upon which he pretends to prove that there were in fact no ſuch Conſecrations at all; and his Reaſon is, [i] *becauſe* Harding *and the other Catholicks of that time, who were upon the Spot, or could not be ignorant of what paſſed in the Promotion of theſe Biſhops, conteſted the Fact of theſe Ordinations at the time, or a few Years after.* How does the *Father* ſhew that they *conteſted* the very Fact of theſe Ordinations? His Proof of it is, becauſe *they reproached our Biſhops with their having been never ordained; and defied them to ſhew* when and by whom *they had received Impoſition of Hands.* He ſhould not, as I have obſerved before [k], have ſaid, *when*, but *how and by whom*; for it is to thoſe Queſtions only that *Harding*, *Stapleton*, *&c.* defied our Biſhops to give any Anſwer. But *Le Quien* ſays, this proves *that it was notorious that they were never ordained, otherwiſe it muſt be ſaid that theſe Doctors* of theirs *were* (*des étourdis, des extravagants*) Men whoſe *Brains were turned*, and

[i] T. 1. p. 248, 307. [k] P. 249.

Dotards,

Dotards, whoſe Folly and Impoſture might eaſily be confuted by as many Witneſſes as there were Men in the City of London, *and even in all* England. Let the *Father* now ſee, that this Way of Reaſoning ſhews either that he deſigned to impoſe upon his Readers, or that he himſelf was in ſome degree *étourdi*, that is, his Head was giddy and diſturbed. For did not *Harding* put theſe very Queſtions to himſelf, *How and by whom* he was ordained Deacon in King *Edward*'s time? and was not his Reaſon for it that he began then to think that he had received no Ordination, and was not truly and really Deacon? Muſt he not then, by *Le Quien*'s way of arguing, be plainly wild and out of his Senſes, to queſtion his being ordained Deacon, and call himſelf to an account *how and by whom he had received Impoſition of Hands*, when he *knew perfectly* that *in fact* he had Hands laid upon him by one of King *Edward*'s Biſhops, who took upon him to give him the Order of Deacon according to the Form in the Ordinal of that King? This 'tis plain he knew and confeſſes, and yet renounces that Ordination as invalid and of no effect, becauſe the Perſon who pretended to give it him was not qualified, and the Form by which he adminiſtered the Order not lawful. And may he not be underſtood to have had the ſame Meaning in denying *Parker*'s and *Jewell*'s Conſecration, without being told that he muſt be either a Fool or a Madman, if he did not mean by that Denial that they had no Ordination *in fact?* But this is the *Fallacy*[1] which runs thro' *Le Quien*'s Way of arguing upon all Occaſions. *Bonner*, though he might very well, upon his Principles, ſay that *Horne*'s four Conſecrators were no Biſhops, either by the Inſtitution of Chriſt and his Apoſtles, or the Canons of the Church, or the Laws of the

[1] Sup. p. 203.

Land,

Land, yet when he ſays, Horne *had not four Biſhops at his Conſecration*, he muſt be looked upon (as *Le Quien* [m] ſays) to be *void of all Senſe and Reaſon*, if he did not mean to deny that he had thoſe *four Perſons* to be his Conſecrators. And for the ſame Reaſon we muſt believe that *Stapleton* and *Harding*, when they defy our Biſhops to ſhew *by whom* they were conſecrated, muſt mean not that their Conſecrators were no true, or canonical, or legal Biſhops, but that they had none at all to lay Hands upon them. In this *Le Quien* is followed by the *Remarker*, and both of them may be looked upon to be led by *Fitzherbert* [n] firſt, and after him by another *Writer*, who has the Face to ſtick at nothing that it comes into his Head to declare with Confidence. "To ſay (that *Writer* tells us [o]) "that Dr. *Harding*, *Stapleton*, *Briſtow*, *Reynolds*, "and others, ſhould object in Print againſt our "Proteſtant Biſhops Want of Ordination, without enquiring or examining whether they were "ordained or no (that is, as he ſays before, whether there was *any* ſuch *viſible and publick Solemnity*) is in equivalent Terms to call them "*Fools* and *Knaves*." He had ſaid in his former Treatiſe [p], "It is Want of Charity and Judgment to think (or, as he explains himſelf in the "*Nullity* [q], *No Man of Conſcience or Common Senſe* "*can imagine*) that the Catholick Doctors of thoſe "times—— who forſook all at Home for Conſcience ſake, ſhould, without examining the "Buſineſs, publiſh to the World in Print the "Nullity of *Parker*'s Ordination, and charge "him and all the reſt with being *unſent*, *uncalled*, "*unconſecrated*, and thereby engage Poſterity to "commit ſo many damnable Sacrileges, in the

The arguing of the Author of the Nullity, *that we ought out of* Charity *to* Harding *and* Stapleton *to believe they were certain that there was no Conſecration at* Lambeth.

[m] P. 257. ſup. p. 200. [n] Remarks on F. Le Courayer, p 103. [o] Nullity of the Prelatick Clergy, p. 1.
[p] Treatiſe of Cath. Faith and Hereſy, p. 19.
[q] Pref. N. IV. Book p. 35.

"re-

" re-ordaining thoſe who had been already valid-
" ly ordained." By which, as he ſays in the *Nullity*[r], *they muſt wilfully damn their own Souls*; that is, *by their obliging Poſterity, upon Miſinformation, to re-ordain our Miniſters.* The *Buſineſs* which they were to examine was, as he means, the Fact of *Parker*'s Conſecration, which thoſe Catholick Doctors, in *charging him with being unſent, uncalled, and unconſecrated*, muſt mean, was no other Ordination than that at the *Tavern*, or elſe he gives them all up for *Fools* and *Knaves*, and *for Men that would wilfully damn their own Souls.*

Upon ſuch Grounds this weak but confident *Writer* would oblige us, if we have either *Charity*, or *Conſcience*, or *Common Senſe*, to believe that *Harding* and *Stapleton*, *&c.* objected to *Parker* and the reſt of our firſt Biſhops, that they had in fact no Conſecration at *Lambeth*, but at the *Nag's-Head.* But he, and thoſe that copy from ſo worthy an *Author*, muſt give us leave to ſay, that without Breach of Charity or good Conſcience, and without any Contradiction to Common Senſe, we believe, becauſe we plainly ſee it, that the moſt that both theſe two Writers (*Harding* eſpecially, who, as I have proved, is the moſt plain and poſitive, *le plus net & le plus formel*, in this Particular) ever had in their Thoughts to object againſt the Ordination of *Jewell*, *Parker*, *&c.* was that there were no *true Biſhops* among the Proteſtants to give them a *true and valid* Ordination. This Defect, it muſt be granted, they object againſt our firſt Ordinations, and upon that Ground would have been ready to juſtify the re-ordaining of the *Engliſh* Clergy that came over from the Communion of our Church to theirs, and to recommend the Practice of Re-ordination

[r] Ibid.

to

to Poſterity, upon account of the Invalidity of our Ordinations: But then what Ground has this Writer to affirm confidently that they muſt wilfully damn their Souls by countenancing and encouraging this Practice, except they had full Aſſurance not only of the *Invalidity* of the Ordinations, but that our firſt Biſhops had not in *fact* any Ordination, or none but that at the *Tavern*? Not to mention that the re-ordaining our Clergy by the Governours of their Church had its Foundation, before either *Stapleton* or *Harding* writ againſt our Ordinations, in the uncharitable Spirit of the Party in Queen *Mary*'s time, which made ſome of them ſo forward as to [f] unbiſhop not only King *Edward*'s Biſhops conſecrated by his Form, but others who had been conſecrated by the Form in the *Roman* Pontifical, and by Biſhops who had received their Conſecration from Biſhops of King *Henry* VIII.'s time; againſt whoſe Orders therefore they could have no other Objection, but that their Conſecrators and themſelves were Hereticks and Schiſmaticks, that is, Proteſtants.

16. We have ſeen, in the foregoing Chapter, *Harding*'s Objections againſt the Ordination of *Jewell* and his Brethren; and in this Chapter, the Biſhop's Anſwers to thoſe Objections, as well as his Adverſary's Reply, and his own Rejoinder to ſuch Parts of his Reply as he thought deſerved it. And now I may conclude, upon the whole View of what appears both in *Stapleton* and this Writer, firſt, that neither of them ever thought of objecting to our Biſhops any ſuch Ordination as that at the *Nag's-Head* Tavern; neither of them ever ſpeaking a Word that can be proved to look that way, tho' it appears ſo often, in the Courſe of

[f] Le Courayer's Diſſertation, p. 247.

the Diſpute, that their Subject called upon them to reproach our Prelates openly with that ſcandalous Fact, if they had known of it; and it cannot be conceived that Men of their Principles and Temper could ever have been guilty of an Omiſſion ſo prejudicial to their own Cauſe. Secondly, that neither of them ſay any thing that imports a Denial of the *Fact* of the Conſecration of *Jewell* or *Parker*, *&c.* at *Lambeth*, by thoſe Perſons and that Form of which we have an authentick Account in the Acts of their Conſecrations in the Regiſter; much leſs that their Words imply a Denial, as *Le Quien* attempts to perſuade us, that thoſe firſt Biſhops of ours ever had *any Ordination or Impoſition of Hands at all*, *any Ceremony*, *or Solemnity*, to make them Biſhops, but only the Authority of Queen *Elizabeth*'s *Letters Patents*. Thirdly, that the Point of Diſpute maintained by theſe two Writers was, that our Prelates *Parker*, *Jewell*, and their Brethren, had not Impoſition of Hands from true or lawful *Biſhops*, or that they were not ordained by a valid or lawful *Form*. Laſtly, therefore, that *Fitzherbert* artfully impoſes upon his Readers, by pretending that the Diſpute about the *Nag's-Head* Ordination was an [t] *Old Quarrel in the Beginning of Queen* Elizabeth's *Reign*, *between their two Learned Doctors* Harding *and* Stapleton, *and their Adverſaries* Jewell *and* Horne: And F. *Le Quien*, with the like Sincerity, preſently after his Citation of *Fitzherbert*'s Words to this Purpoſe, makes it to have been [v] *the eſſential and capital Point of the Controverſy for fifty Years* (that is, from the Beginning of Queen *Elizabeth*'s Reign to the time of *Fitzherbert*'s writing) that their Writers *call in queſtion* our firſt Biſhops *having any Ordination whatſoever*, *and not* (as *it is* (he ſays) *the Pretence and Evaſion* (*defaite* is his Word) *of*

[t] Sup. p. 235. [v] T. 1. p. 246.

Bramhall

Bramhall *and other* Engliſh *Proteſtant Writers, from whom his Adverſary F.* Le Courayer *learnt to make uſe of it*) *that the Diſpute was about the* Validity or Invalidity *of the Ordination which they had received.* It is plain that during ſo great a part of *Le Quien*'s fifty Years, as from 1559 to the time of *Stapleton*'s Deceaſe, who lived till near the End of that Century, and writ *Ann.* 1596. two Years before his Death, his *Relectio Principiorum, &c.* and *Triplicat. adv. Whitakerum*, in both which Diſcourſes, ſo near the time when the Tavern-Story firſt appeared, a full Account of it might have been expected from him, if then or at any time before he had been informed of that Fact: It is plain, I ſay, that for the time that this Writer maintained the Diſpute againſt our Orders, and for the time that *Harding* was engaged in the Controverſy, nothing more was objected, but that the Ordinations of our firſt Biſhops were either not *valid or lawful*, for want of the Conſecrators being true and lawful *Biſhops*, and the Perſons conſecrated having the Pope's *Confirmation*; or not *Canonical* or *Legal* for want of King *Edward*'s *Form* of Ordination being authorized by the *Canons and Practice* of their Church, or by the *Statutes* of our own Realm. And if all this might be objected by both theſe Writers, and yet both of them might have confeſſed notwithſtanding, that *Parker* had in fact Impoſition of Hands from *Barlow*, *Scory*, *Coverdale* and *Hodgskins*, at the Time and Place ſpecified in his Regiſter; and that *Jewell* and others had in fact the Hands of *Parker* and his Aſſiſtants laid upon them, as it is related in the Acts of their Conſecrations in the ſame Regiſter: And that the Ceremony of conſecrating the Arch-Biſhop firſt, and the others after him, was performed actually in all Points according to King *Edward*'s Form of conſecrating Arch-Biſhops and Biſhops: If ſuch a Confeſſion might

might be conſiſtent with every thing that they are found to ſay againſt our Ordinations, then the Readers of the Church of *England*, or in Communion of the *Roman* Church, are to conſider, how much they are impoſed upon by ſuch Writers, as endeavour to amuſe them with the Authority of ſo many Places in *Stapleton* and *Harding*, wherein they are pretended to declare either for the Fact of the *Nag's-Head* Ordination, or againſt the Fact of the Ordinations related in the *Lambeth* Regiſter. This appears to be the laſt Retrenchment of our Adverſaries, to which they are obliged to retire, when they have nothing elſe left them to ſay in Defence of the Tavern-Story. They tell us with Confidence, that if we look into *Bonner*'s Plea againſt *Horne*, and into the *Writers* of that time, we ſhall find the Fact of that Mock-Conſecration atteſted, or (that which is equivalent to it) the Credit of the Account of the Ordinations of our Biſhops at *Lambeth* utterly deſtroyed. This Shew of ſo good Authority may, they hope, look plauſible, and moſt of their Readers may be inclined to take their Word, rather than to give themſelves the Trouble of entering into a nice Examination of the particular Allegations: But, to ſatisfy any one that is impartial and ſincere, I have fully conſidered every thing that they alledge, or is ſaid elſewhere in their Authors; and have, I hope, ſufficiently proved, that *Bonner* and the Biſhops, and the principal *Writers* of that time, *Harding*, *Stapleton* and *Sanders*, diſcover plainly that they never heard of ſuch a Fact as the Tavern-Ordination, and that nothing can be produced from them, to prove that they had any thought of calling in queſtion the Truth of the Account of the Conſecrations of Arch-Biſhop *Parker* and the reſt of our firſt Biſhops, which has ſtood upon Record from the time in the *Lambeth* Regiſter.

CHAP. XI.

Le Quien's *late Treatiſe of the* Nullity of the *Engliſh* Ordinations, *a Confutation of the former. What he takes upon him to prove in his former Treatiſe. This diſproved in the Treatiſe now publiſhed. Proof of his confuting himſelf, by what he ſays in regard to* Stapleton. *By what he ſays in regard to* Harding. *By what he ſays in regard to* Sanders *and* Bonner. *His falling into the ſame Miſtake with the* Remarker *about the* Point of Diſpute. *His new Argument from an Expreſſion in* Stapleton's Fortreſs of Faith. *His pretending, from the* Preface *to the* Counterblaſt, *that there was an Act of Parliament,* 28 Hen. VIII, *of the making of Biſhops, but not to be found now in the* Statute-Book. *His Interpretation of* Stapleton's *Words,* the very Statutes. *His Interpretation of* Harding's *Words,* Antient Biſhops. *His pretended Diſcoveries in* Bonner's *Caſe. His Charge againſt F.* Le Courayer, *of an Omiſſion of* Heylin's *Words. And of concealing the Argument in the* Cotton *MS. of* Bonner *or his* Counſel, *againſt* Parker's *Conſecration. How little Service that Argument can do to* Le Quien's *Cauſe. Concluſion.*

1. LE QUIEN has preſented the *Publick* lately with a *New Demonſtration* of the *Nullity of the* Engliſh *Ordinations*, both in point of *Fact* and *Right*. It comes to my Hands at a proper

Le Quien's *late Treatiſe of the* Nullity, &c. *a Confutation of*

his former Treatiſe. per time to conſider how the *Father* enforces his Arguments from the Teſtimonies of *Stapleton*, *Harding*, *Sanders*, and others of their Writers, and from Biſhop *Bonner*'s Plea againſt *Horne*, to diſprove the Fact of the Conſecrations of *Parker* and the reſt of Queen *Elizabeth*'s firſt Biſhops. And here I hope I ſhall not be looked upon to be immodeſt or uncharitable, if I ſay that, upon reading this *New Demonſtration*, I could not forbear thinking of what *Soſia*, in *Amphitruo*, ſays of himſelf, after *Mercury* in his Shape had ſo cuffed and buffeted him, as to make him deny himſelf to be *Soſia*, [a] *Ego ille alter Soſia* malis me mulctavit modis. So I muſt own it ſeems to me, that *This ſame other ſecond* Le Quien has very unhappily *quite confuted* that ſame other *former Le Quien*. For this I am in the Reader's Judgment, whether I muſt be looked upon myſelf to be under a Miſtake.

What he takes upon him to prove in his former Treatiſe. The *Father*, in his former Work, makes us believe he has proved from ſo many Places which he alledges in *Stapleton*, *Harding*, *Sanders*, *&c.* [b] that they all, and Biſhop *Bonner* in his *Plea*, do with one Voice aſſure us, ‘ *That our Reformed Prelates were inveſted in their Sees— without having received any Ordination whatſoever, without obſerving that Form that was in uſe under King* Edward, *or* [c] *obſerving any Form of Ordination at all:* ‘ That *they had no* [d] *Impoſition of Hands* at all: That the [e] Ordinal which preſcribes that Ceremony was not made uſe of at their Ordination: ‘ That [f] neither they nor any of Queen *Elizabeth*'s Biſhops were conſecrated by that Form, or had any Impoſition of Hands, either in 1559, or the following Years, till after the *Convocation*, *Ann.* 1562. ‘ That *Sta-*

[a] Plaut. Amphitruo, Act 4. Scen. 3. [b] T. 1. p. 319. See alſo p. 246, 265, 289, 309. [c] Addit. p. ii. [d] Ibid. p. 270, 272. [e] Ibid. p. 269. [f] Ibid. p. 268, 269, 318, Addit. p. ii, iii.

pleton

pleton makes them [g] *ridiculous* in uſing that Ceremony after that time, which never had been uſed before in their own Conſecrations: 'That [h] before that time *they took Poſſeſſion of their Biſhopricks only by vertue of the Queen's Letters Patents, without any Solemnity or Ceremony:* 'Acting herein according to the *Eraſtian* Principles, *which they had been taught by* Cranmer, *of the Prince's having Authority to create the Biſhops and other Miniſters without any Neceſſity of* Ordination. And to compleat all with a Diſcovery of *Le Quien*'s upon this Foundation, 'That [i] *Parker* found himſelf obliged, upon this account, to put a Trick upon the Queen and the Two Houſes, in the Parliament 8 *Eliz.* with the Aſſiſtance of Secretary *Cecil*; that is, to make them, under Cover of declaring that the Queen's Biſhops after 1562. were ordained according to the Form in King *Edward*'s Ordinal, declare that he and *Grindal*, *&c.* of the Queen's *firſt Nomination*, (who he was conſcious had no Impoſition of Hands at all) were in the ſame Caſe with the reſt that were ordained after 1562. with Impoſition of Hands; and all, both the *firſt* and the *latter* Set of Biſhops, were conſecrated by the ſame Form.

His Confutation of himſelf in the Treatiſe lately publiſhed.

This the Reader may have ſeen with his own Eyes, in the firſt *Tome* of *Le Quien*'s Treatiſe of the *Nullity of our Ordinations*, printed, *Ann.* 1725. And muſt he not then be ſurprized to ſee, in his Treatiſe of this Year, all the ſame Places almoſt in their Writers cited again, and almoſt in the ſame Order, with no other Concluſion from them at the foot of the Account, than this, 'That theſe Writers deny that *Parker* and his Brethren had any Impoſition of Hands from *true Biſhops*.

[g] Ibid. p. 280, 281. [h] Ibid. p. 268, 269. Adit. p. ii, iii.
[i] Ibid. p. 426, 427, 428. ſup. p. 176, 177, 178.

This ſhewed by what he ſays in regard to Stapleton.

He begins, in this Treatiſe, with the firſt Place in *Stapleton*'s *Fortreſs of Faith*; which I have laid before the Reader [k] in the Author's Words, and have proved from thence [l] that the *Father* puts a Fallacy upon us, by pretending that the Author affirms that our Biſhops had no Impoſition of Hands *at all*, when the whole that he ſays comes to no more than that they had not the laying on of the Hands of *true Biſhops*. The ſame Paſſage the *Father* ſets down here [m] a Tranſlation of whole and entire, tho' in his firſt Work (as I have obſerved before [n]) he has nothing of it but the Concluſion: And it will ſoon appear whether he does now make any more of it than I have done. Before he gives us the Author's Words, he ſays [o] the Reader will find there *the true Reaſon that* Stapleton *brings againſt the* New Epiſcopacy, *and that he there* abſolutely deſtroys *the Authority of the Regiſters, and* Scraps of Paper (as he is pleaſed to call them) *ſent from* England. He does this, he tells us preſently [p], *by formally charging theſe falſe Biſhops with Intruſion, upon the Defect* (*not of Authority or Juriſdiction in their Conſecrators, but*) *of Impoſition of Hands from* any Biſhop. Then, in Proof of this Charge, he recites the Author's [q] Words, importing, "That *Auſtin* the Monk was made Bi-"ſhop at *Arles*, by the Impoſition of Hands of "*other Biſhops*; but our Pretended Biſhops, up-"on the Deprivation of theirs, could not have "*Epiſcopal* Impoſition of Hands here at Home, "nor would ſeek for it Abroad, and conſequent-"ly had not Hands laid upon them by *any* "*Biſhops*.

Here we ſee how far *Le Quien* falls ſhort of what he had formerly ſaid, when he laid down

[k] Sup. p. 248, 249. [l] Sup. p. 260, 261. [m] Part 1. p. 32, 33, 34. [n] Sup. p. 259. [o] Part 1. p. 31. [p] Ibid. p. 32. [q] Ibid.

the

the State of the Queſtion [r], *That* Stapleton *diſputes our Biſhops having been ordained in any manner whatſoever*; and of what he ſaid juſt before he refers us to this Paſſage in the *Fortreſs* [f], That *he abſolutely denies there that our Biſhops had received* any *Impoſition of Hands*; and what he had ſaid in the Page before, That he *poſitively maintains every where that they were inveſted in their Sees without Solemnity, without Ceremony, being ſatisfied with the Queen's* Nomination by her *Letters Patents*; and of what he had ſaid beſides (in the other Places juſt now referr'd to) to convince the Reader of the Nullity of our Ordinations in point of *Fact*. His Author's Meaning is, as the *Father* confeſſes here, That they had not the Impoſition of *Biſhops* Hands; and could it then be pretended that he muſt neceſſarily have a Meaning ſo very different in the ſame Words, 'That they had not only *no Epiſcopal* Impoſition of Hands, but *no* Impoſition of Hands *whatſoever?*

Le Quien proceeds to tell us [t], That the Author, after this Paſſage, goes on *to a very great Length, to prove that the Vocation and Miſſion of Paſtors depends upon their having the laying on of Biſhops Hands*; and that *from thence he concludes, That Queen* Elizabeth's *Biſhops having not received Epiſcopal Impoſition of Hands, have no Right to execute the Functions of that Order.* The Argument we have *p.* 46. (after the Repetition of ſome Part of the ſame Paſſage in the Pages before) from St. *Paul's receiving his own Miſſion in* Form *by Impoſition of Hands* (*of the Elders*, he ſhould have added) *and his making* Timothy *and* Titus *Biſhops by the laying on of his Hands*, &c. agreeably to the Account I have given in the Pages here referred to [v]. After which the *Father* [w] gives us the Senſe

[r] T. 1. p. 246. ſup. p. 248. [f] T. 1. p. 270. ſup. p. 261.
[t] Part 1. p. 34. [v] Sup. p. 262, 263. [w] Part 1. p. 47.

of thoſe Words, *Proteſtantes hoc Sacramentum rejicient, &c.* cited above[y]; and cites the Words [z] *Iſti nuper intruſi Superintendentes, &c.* in both which Places the Author, by laying on of the Hands of the *Presbytery*, means *Epiſcopal* Impoſition of Hands, and *Le Quien* ſeems to grant that he has that Meaning, tho' in the firſt Paſſage he renders the Words *ſine omni impoſitione manuum* Presbyterii; *Sans qu'on leur ait en* aucune maniere *impoſé les mains*; that is, *without* any one *having laid Hands upon them in* any Manner: *any one, in any Manner*, inſtead of *any one of the Presbytery*, that is, of the College of *Biſhops*. He adds[a] a third Paſſage, from the Concluſion of that *Section* in the *Fortreſs of Faith*, *Moderni autem Superintendentes, &c.* The Words in the original *Engliſh* I have ſet down[b], "Your Pretended Biſhops "have no *ſuch* Ordination, no *ſuch* laying on of "Hands of *other Biſhops, &c.*" which are rendered in *Latin*, Nullam *habent Ordinationem*, nullam *manuum impoſitionem*.

Page 50. he propounds to ſhew, that the Author *often, in his many other Treatiſes, repeats the ſame Charge againſt our* Falſe Biſhops, *That they had neither Vocation, nor Miſſion, nor any Impoſition of Hands of any* Biſhop *whatſoever, there being not one found in the Realm who would perform that Ceremony*. He cites the[c] *Return of Untruths to* Jewell, to ſhew that *Stapleton*'s Words there are a[d] *plain Teſtimony that our Prelates invaded the Office without the Impoſition of any* Biſhops *Hands*; and the [e] *Counterblaſt to* Horne, to prove that the Author declares there, that [f] *No* Biſhop *preſided in his Ordination by laying his Hands upon him:* And a Paſſage in the [g] *Principia Doctrinalia*, (parallel to

[y] Sup. p. 263, 264. [z] Part 1. ibid. ſup. p. 264.
[a] Part 1. p. 48. [b] Sup. p. 265. [c] Ibid. p. 51. ſup. p. 268. [d] P. 52. [e] Ibid. p. 61. ſup. p. 267. [f] P. 62.
[g] P. 64.

that

that in the *Fortreſs*, of *Auſtin* the *Monk*) where, he ſays, Stapleton *wholly requires Epiſcopal Impoſition of Hands to the Miſſion and Vocation of Paſtors, and finds none in our* New Biſhops. The like Concluſion he draws from his *Homily*, as he calls it, for the Feaſt of St. *Mark* [h], That there, *without making any Difference between* Luther *and our Prelates*, he ſays, *they had no Impoſition of Hands from any foreign* (*German* or *French*) Biſhop, *nor from any other Perſon of that which they called the* Reformed Church. And again, from his [i] *Relectio Principiorum Doctrinalium*, where, he ſays, [k] *he puts the* Engliſh *in the ſame Claſs with the* Calviniſts *and* Lutherans— *that none of their Miniſters had received any* Epiſcopal *Ordination.*

The like Interpretation he gives us of *Harding*'s Words, [l] *His Citations from him*, he ſays, *prove that no true Biſhop ever laid his Hands upon the New Biſhop of* Salisbury (Jewell) *or his Metropolitan* Parker. That Author, he ſays, [m] demands of *Jewell* to *ſhew that he had received Power to execute the Epiſcopal Function by the Impoſition of a* Biſhop's *Hands.* The Place I have ſet down [n] in the Author's Words, as *Le Quien* himſelf does [o] afterwards, *At leaſt ſhew us that you have received Power to do the Office you preſume to exerciſe, by due Order of laying on of Hands and Conſecration*; and the *Father* very rightly interprets *due Order of laying on of Hands*, to be by the Hands of a *Biſhop*. *Harding* likewiſe, he ſays, calls in queſtion [p] whether *Jewell* were *Prieſt* or no, *not having at that time any* Biſhop *to ordain him*; and for the ſame Reaſon denies him to be a Biſhop: And compares [q] him in this regard to *Iſchyras* and *Zacchæus*, and declares that the *Engliſh* had their Orders

Proved from what he ſays in regard to Harding.

[h] P. 69. ſup. p. 274. [i] P. 70. ſup. p. 280, & ſeq.
[k] P. 72. [l] P. 77. [m] P. 77, 78. [n] Sup. p. 362.
[o] P. 81. [p] P. 78, 79. ſup. p. 346, 356.
[q] Ibid. ſup. p. 357, 388.

from [r] *Monks and Friars Apoſtates, and excommunicate Prieſts not having* Biſhoply *Power*; upon whoſe Deceaſe he aſks what will become of their Church? and ſays to *Jewell*, after demanding his *Letters of Orders*, that [f] *he had neither Order nor Conſecration*, becauſe *None of the* New Miniſters *could give him that which he had not himſelf*; agreeably, as *Le Quien* obſerves, to what he had ſaid before, That the Proteſtants [t] *had not in their Sect conſecrated Biſhops*; and *all Holy Orders were given by* Biſhops *only*.

Proved from what he ſays of Sanders *and* Bonner.

I go on to ſhew that he makes the like Uſe of *Sanders* and *Bonner*, the former of whom he owns [v] that he *cited before, and cites him now again, to confirm what* Stapleton *and others of that time maintain conſtantly, that Queen* Elizabeth's *firſt Biſhops were inveſted in their Sees without the Impoſition of Hands of* any Biſhops. And the *principal Ground* of the Plea of the latter he makes to be that [x] Parker *himſelf was not conſecrated by any* Biſhop. He gives us a new [y] Verſion of the Paſſages in *Sanders*'s *Hiſtory of the* Engliſh *Schiſm*, and an *Extract*, as before, of ſo much of the Author's Text in *Latin* as he pleaſes; and thoſe Words *Ita omni legitimâ Ordinatione deſtituti*, which he rendred before [z], *Ils ne reçûrent* aucune *Ordination*; *They had no Ordination at all*, inſtead of no *lawful* Ordination, he tranſlates now, [a] *n'avoient pas etè ordonnes ſelon les Loix quelles qu'elles fuſſent, they were not ordained according to* any Laws *whatſoever:* Which he interprets as ſpoken [b] *in Conſequence of our New Superintendents not having Hands laid upon them by any* true Biſhop. The Words in the latter Part of his Extract are now *ſine ullâ* [c] Epiſcopali *Conſecratione*, inſtead of what he had

[r] P. 80. ſup. p. 389, 390. [f] P. 81. ſup. p. 362.
[t] Sup. p. 337. [v] P. 109. [x] P. 157. [y] P. 111.
[z] Sup. p. 5. [a] P. 117. [b] P. 120. [c] P. 118.

before,

before, *ſine* [d] *ullâ Conſecratione*, leaving out *Epiſcopali*.

The Omiſſion of this Word in the *Latin* Text of *Sanders*, he expects [e] that his Readers ſhould believe he was not aware of; and chaſtiſes his learned *Adverſary* very ſeverely, for *making ſo much of a mere Trifle*, and reflecting upon it as an Inſtance of *Unfaithfulneſs*. I muſt own myſelf to be obliged to anſwer this Charge, having been ſo unhappy as, in the Entrance upon this Diſcourſe [f], to think I had Reaſon to take notice of *Le Quien*'s miſ-tranſlating *Sanders*, and leaving out what he thought fit both in his own *Verſion* and the Author's *Text*; which I was ſo forward as to look upon to be done not thro' *Inadvertency*, but with a Deſign to ſerve a Cauſe. To the Reaſons that I give there, I need add no more but this Obſervation, That the *Father* produces *Sanders*'s Teſtimony, in his former Treatiſe, [g] after *Bonner*'s, *Stapleton*'s and *Harding*'s, who had been taught by *Le Quien* to ſay, that our Biſhops had *no Ordination*, *no Impoſition of Hands*, nothing of any ſuch *Solemnity* or *Ceremony*, neither *Parker* nor any other of our Biſhops having any Hands laid upon them before the *Convocation*, *Ann.* 1562. Could he then, when he came to *Sanders*, allow him to expreſs himſelf in a Language ſo very different, as inſtead of *No Ordination* at all, to ſay only *No* Epiſcopal, or *No* Lawful *Ordination?* when his *Interpreter* was to declare in the Concluſion of his Allegation from him [h], "That *Bonner*, *Staple-*
"*ton*, *Harding*, and *Sanders* himſelf, poſitively
"affirm with one Voice, that our Reformed Pre-
"lates were inveſted in their Sees, only by ver-
"tue of the Queen's Letters Patents, without
"having ever received any Ordination *whatſoever*,

[d] Sup. p. 5. [e] P. 119. [f] Sup. p. 5, 6.
[g] T. 1. p. 309. [h] T. 1. p. 318, 319.

"without

" without obſerving that *Form* which was in uſe " in King *Edward*'s time? "

But *Le Quien* would aſk me, as he does F. *Le Courayer* [i], *Could I have ſuch a Thought? Is it poſſible that to make this Place in* Sanders *ſerve his Cauſe, he could omit a Word of ſo great Importance for the better Defence of that Cauſe?* If we aſk what Cauſe, he will ſay that which he maintains [k] in *all that he has ſaid and proved, juſqu' ici*, (that is, to the Place where he is now ſpeaking) That *Stapleton* and *Sanders atteſt equally that our Superintendents never received Ordination from the Hands of any* Biſhop. But is this the Cauſe that he maintains not only in this, but all along in his former Treatiſe? In *This* it appears to be his Buſineſs; but in the Treatiſe of the other *former* French *Writer of the Nullity of the* Engliſh *Ordinations*, I have fully ſhewed that he has another Buſineſs and Deſign, to make us believe that he was proving that our Biſhops had no Impoſition of Hands *at all*; tho' all his Proofs amounted to no more than that they had no *Epiſcopal* Impoſition of Hands. By this, as I intimated [l], he ſeemed to have led the Author of the *Remarks* into a Miſtake, as if no Impoſition of *Epiſcopal* Hands, were the ſame as no Impoſition of Hands *at all*; not only no *valid* Ordination, but *none at all*, that is, (as the *Remarker* ſays) *none from any* Biſhop; and made him look upon it as a Diſproof of the *Fact* of the Ordinations, and of the Truth of the *Lambeth* Regiſter, that *Stapleton* denies that our Prelates were conſecrated by *true Biſhops*. This, in that Writer, I reflected upon, as a Proof of his being [m] ignorant of the very Point of Diſpute that lay before him; that he knew ſo little of it as to take the Queſtion of *Fact* to be, not ' Whether our Biſhops

[i] P. 119. [k] P. 120. [l] Sup. p. 291, 292, 293.
[m] Sup. p. 294.

were

were ordained by the *Perſons* named in the Regiſter for their Conſecrators; but 'Whether they were ordained by *true Biſhops*.

His falling into the ſame Miſtake with the Remarker *of the Point in Diſpute.*

And muſt it not be very ſurprizing to find now, in *Le Quien*'s Second Treatiſe, that this very Alteration of the State of the Queſtion is the Foundation of his Arguments from *Stapleton*, *Harding*, and *Sanders*, againſt the *Fact* of our Ordinations? *Stapleton*, he ſays, [n] *abſolutely ruins the Authority of our Regiſter*. If he does, it muſt be by proving that *Parker* and the reſt of our Biſhops were not ordained as the Regiſter relates. And how does *Stapleton* prove that? *Le Quien* anſwers, from *this Defect, their not having the Impoſition of Hands of any Biſhop*. So again, when he ſpeaks of *Sanders*'s denying that our Biſhops had *Epiſcopal Conſecration*, he ſays [o], (and reflects upon his Learned *Adverſary* for not obſerving it) that this is *contradictory to the* Romance *of the* Lambeth *Conſecration*. The *Father* thinks himſelf to be ſo very clear in the Matter, that we muſt not take it to proceed from bare *Confidence*, that he calls it a *Romance*: but if what *Sanders* ſays of our Biſhops not having *Epiſcopal Ordination* is *contradictory* to it, then if that which he ſays be true, the Account of the *Lambeth* Conſecration muſt be falſe. This we ſee gives us plainly to underſtand, that *Le Quien*'s preſent State of the Queſtion is the ſame with that which we had in the *Remarker*, 'Whether our Biſhops were ordained by *true Biſhops*, 'Whether they had, that which *Sanders* and *Stapleton* denies they had, *Epiſcopal Conſecration*.

Le Quien's firſt State of the Point of Diſpute, which he takes upon him to ſhew was maintained by their Doctors, *Stapleton*, *&c.* was, [p] That our firſt Biſhops *were not ordained in any manner whatſoever*,

[n] P. 32. 289, 331. [o] P. 119. [p] T. 1. p. 246. ſup. p. 248,

ſoever. Is this the ſame Point of Diſpute with that which he gives us now, That they were not ordained by *true Biſhops?* If it be, it muſt neceſſarily follow, that there can be no Ordination or Impoſition of Hands *whatſoever*, but *Epiſcopal* Ordination or Impoſition of Hands: The contrary to which we are aſſured of from common Senſe, as well as from *Stapleton*'s Conceſſion [q], that there may be Impoſition of Hands, not from Biſhops only, but from Perſons that are no more than *Laicks* or *Presbyters*; and from *Harding*'s [r] Confeſſion in the Caſe of *Iſchyras*, and the Confeſſions of them both in regard to the Miſſion of the Clergy in ours and other Proteſtant Churches. So it appears how little the State of the Point in Diſpute, as we have it now from the ſame Author, agrees with that which he had laid down before in his former Treatiſe.

He tells us there beſides, that the Queſtion [s] *was not about the Validity* or *Invalidity of the Ordinations which our Biſhops had received.* But I aſk, was the Queſtion then as he makes it now, Whether they had received Ordination from *true Biſhops?* If it was, is there any thing elſe that can be pretended to make an Ordination [t] *valid or invalid*, in regard to the *Perſons ordaining*, but their being or not being the Proper Miniſters of Ordination, that is, *True Biſhops?* If this is the true Ground of the Validity or Invalidity of Ordinations, then the Queſtion, 'Whether they were ordained by *true Biſhops*, muſt be the ſame as, 'Whether they were *validly* ordained. So *Le Quien* is at laſt forced to come to an Agreement with his learned *Adverſary*, and Biſhop *Bramhall* and the *Engliſh* Proteſtant Writers: And what he rejected before as a mere [v] *Pretence* and *Evaſion* of

[q] Sup. p. 281, 291. [r] Sup. p. 388. [s] T. 1. ib.
[t] Sup. p. 294. [v] T. 1. p. 246. ſup. p. 462, 463.

theirs,

theirs, let him now himſelf evade if he can, and ſhew that he does not plainly acknowledge it to be the true State of the Queſtion.

It may be pretended, that their Writers denying that *Parker*, *&c.* had true Biſhops for their Conſecrators, is a Denial and Diſproof of the Truth of the Regiſter, becauſe that gives the Conſecrators the *Title of Biſhops:* It may likewiſe be pretended, that it implies a Denial of King *Edward*'s Form being uſed in their Conſecration, becauſe that Form preſcribes the Office to be performed by *Biſhops*. The firſt Pretence is [w] *Le Quien*'s, the other the [x] *Remarker*'s, and a full Anſwer [y] has been given to both, which I need not give my ſelf the Trouble of repeating in this Place.

If *Le Quien* could have proved in his former Treatiſe, by his Allegations from *Harding* and *Stapleton*, *&c.* that they declare that our firſt Biſhops had no Impoſition of Hands at all, no Uſe of that Ceremony; or if he could have proved ſo much as that theſe Writers ſay they had not Hands laid upon them by the Perſons who are related in the Regiſter to be their Conſecrators; he might then, with very good Grounds, have inferred that they contradict the *Lambeth* Regiſter; and, if their Teſtimony is to be credited, *ruin abſolutely* the Authority of the Acts of Conſecration that ſtand there upon Record. But it has been fully ſhewed [z] that the *Father*, in the Diſpute, puts a *Fallacy* upon us, and proves no more, than that our Prelates had not the Impoſition of Hands of *true Biſhops*. For this we have now his own Confeſſion, in the *Work* that lies before us, where he draws no other Concluſion from the ſame Allegations: And what Way then has he left to ſhew

[w] T. 1. p. 294. [x] P. 298. [y] Sup. p. 210, 211, 372, 373, & ſeq. [z] Sup. p. 261, & ſeq.

that theſe Writers deſtroy the Authority of our Regiſter? The ſame that I have expoſed [a] as ſo weak and irrational, in the Author of the *Remarks*; that is, to make no Impoſition of *Biſhops* Hands, and no Impoſition of Hands *at all*; no *valid* Ordination, and none *at all*, to be the ſame thing. Muſt he not then by this way of Reaſoning, make [b] *Athanaſius*'s denying that *Iſchyras* had true Ordination to the Prieſthood from *Colluthus*'s Hands, to be the ſame with his denying that *Collathus* laid his Hands upon him? And *Harding*'s [c] denying that he was truly ordained Deacon in King *Edward*'s time, to be a Denial that any Perſon, that took upon him to give Holy Orders in that King's Reign, laid his Hands upon him to ordain him Deacon? 'Tis juſt the ſame Reaſoning, as to argue from *Stapleton*'s and *Harding*'s Denial that *Parker*, *&c.* had any true Biſhops for their Conſecrators, as if it were a Denial that *Parker* had *Barlow*, and the reſt named in the Regiſter, for his Conſecrators, and that *Jewell* and *Horne* had *Parker* for their Conſecrator, and the others who the Regiſter aſſures us aſſiſted *Parker* in the Ceremony.

LeQuien's *New Argument from an Expreſſion in the* Fortreſs of Faith.

In his firſt Citation from *Stapleton*'s *Fortreſs of Faith*, the *Father* diſcovers one Expreſſion, [d] *very remarkable*, as he tells us, which had *eſcaped him in his former Treatiſe*. The Words in the original *Engliſh* are, That our firſt Biſhops [e] *had not come in by the Door, but ſtolen in like Thieves, without all Spiritual Authority or Government*. It is for *Le Quien*'s Convenience to take the Paſſage rather as he finds it in the Tranſlator, *Ut fures clanculum aliundè ſubintrârunt*; which he renders, that *as Thieves they ſlipt in another Way* ſecretly (*en cachete*) *into the Sheepfold*. And this Word (*en cachete*) *ſe-*

[a] Sup. p. 290, & ſeq. [b] Sup. p. 357, 388.
[c] Sup. p. 365, & ſeq. [d] P. 45. [e] Sup. p. 249.

cretly,

cretly, he inſiſts upon as *directly oppoſite to the pretended* Solemnity *of* Parker's *Conſecration*; and accordingly lays it [f] very often before the Reader, to convince him that the Arch-Biſhop was never conſecrated in that publick ſolemn Manner. I muſt confeſs it *eſcaped me*, to dream that this Expreſſion could be made uſe of to ſo great Purpoſe; and I take it for a ſign that the *Father*'s Reaſoning runs low, when he ſubmits to trouble his Readers with ſuch (*minuties*) *Grammatical Trifles*, and ſets them forth as *very remarkable*, and nothing leſs than Demonſtration. It is juſt ſuch a Proof as that which he brought from the Presbyterian Author of the [g] *Demonſtration of Diſcipline*, that our Ordinations were made *in a Corner*, (*en cachete & dans un coin*, as he renders the Word) with which Expreſſion he was ſo tranſported, as to declare it to be *deciſive againſt the Relation of the* Lambeth *Regiſter*, and ſuch as he could not *ſee any Reply that could be made to it*. He has had time to have his Eyes opened by the Learned F. *Le Courayer*, and to ſee it is far from being ſo *deciſive* and *unanſwerable*; and ſo, in this Treatiſe, he is willing [h] to give it up, and to lay the Blame of his *own Forwardneſs* upon his Leader *Fitz-Simon*; but then he expects his Readers ſhould take the Expreſſion in [i] *Stapleton* for an *Equivalent*, and look upon that, inſtead of the other, to be an *unanſwerable* and *deciſive* Proof againſt the Relation of *Parker*'s Conſecration in the *Lambeth* Regiſter. But I may aſk, Does not *Stapleton*, in another [k] Part of his Works cited above, declare of the Proteſtant Miniſters in general, and of our Biſhops in particular, that all of them are *Thieves and Robbers, according to the Words of our Bleſſed Saviour*, John x. becauſe they came not in by the

[f] P. 45, 53, 72, 73, 123, 145. [g] T. 1. p. 202, 203.
[h] P. 72, 73. [i] Ibid. [k] Sup. p. 281.

Door of *Epiſcopal Ordination?* And if he gives our Prelates, in this reſpect, the Name of *Robbers*, as well as *Thieves*, is not there as good Reaſon to underſtand him that, as Robbers, they *broke* into the Fold *openly* and in *publick*, as that, as Thieves, they *ſlipt* in *privately* and in *ſecret?* But it is not worth the while to make this Trifle the Subject of Diſpute, but rather to leave the *Father* to enjoy the Satisfaction of having at laſt publiſhed to the World this *remarkable* Diſcovery, which had unhappily *eſcaped* him in his former Treatiſe. He makes the like Uſe of another Expreſſion in the Preface to the *Counterblaſt*, [l] *Novo & inaudito more & ritu ordinatos*; which he is pleaſed to underſtand of an *eſſential Defect* in this *unheard of kind of Ordination.* But I need only refer the Reader to the *Engliſh* Words before [m] cited, and the natural Senſe of them.

His pretending from the Preface to the Counterblaſt, *that there was an Act of Parliament*, 28 H. 8. of the making of Biſhops; *but not to be found now in the* Statute-Book.

In one of his [n] Citations from the Preface to the *Counterblaſt*, it was very eaſy for *Le Quien* to think there might be a Miſtake (either of the Author or the Printer) in the Year of King *Henry* the VIII[th]'s Reign, wherein the Statute, about the Method of electing and conſecrating our Biſhops, was made in Parliament, which is there ſet down as his twenty eighth Year. The *Father*, in his firſt Treatiſe, cites a great Part of that Statute [o] as made in the twenty fifth Year of his Reign, and in this Treatiſe [p] owns it was the Statute of that Year which Queen *Elizabeth* revived. Yet here he thinks it for his Turn to lead the Reader into a Belief [q] that there was really ſuch an Act paſſed, *Ann.* 28 *Hen.* VIII. and tells him, no ſuch Act is *now to be found*; and then puts the Queſtion, Whether thoſe *who were not willing to obey it, did not put it out of the way*; that

[l] P. 56, 57. [m] Sup. p. 312. [n] P. 54. [o] T. 1. p. 489.
[p] P. 55. [q] P. 54.

is,

is, expunge it out of the *Statute-Book?* Here we have a pregnant Inſtance of the *Father*'s Acuteneſs and Sagacity, as well as of his Charity for thoſe whom he calls Hereticks. The like we have again, where he is ſpeaking of *Bonner*'s Caſe, and ſays that the [r] *Records of the Proceſs* between him and *Horne*, *are not to be found*; and the Reaſon he is pleaſed to give for it is, That *they who were Maſters of them did not think fit to tranſmit them to Poſterity*. The Reader is left to make that charitable Inference himſelf, that they were not willing to publiſh their own Diſgrace.

His Interpretation of Stapleton's *Words*, the very Statutes.

Stapleton, in the ſame *Preface*, expreſly affirms, as has been ſhewed [s], that our Biſhops were ordained by King *Edward*'s Form. *Le Quien*, on the contrary, pretends to prove from his Words in the firſt Chapter [t], that he denies the *firſt Set* of them to have been conſecrated by that Form. And I have ſhewed that by this he makes him guilty of a double [v] Self-contradiction, and may refer the Reader to the Proofs I have made of it. Here I ſhall only compare *Le Quien*'s preſent Senſe with that which he had in his former Treatiſe. *Stapleton*'s Words are, "Quis neſcit te tuoſque "Collegas non dico aliter quam requirunt Ca- "nones, ſed nec ſecundum præſcriptum Statuto- "rum veſtrorum ordinatos eſſe?" The Paſſage in *Engliſh* [w] I have ſet down under the *Latin*, where for *nec ſecundum præſcriptum Statutorum veſtrorum*, it is in the Original, *not according to the Preſcript of the* very Statutes. The Interpretation that *Le Quien* gave us in his firſt Treatiſe is, that [x] *they did not receive the Ordination which was authorized by the* Laws *of the* Realm. In this Treatiſe,

[r] P. 148, 149. [s] Sup. p. 301, 302. [t] Sup. p. 304.
[v] Sup. p. 305, & ſeq. [w] Sup. p. 304.
[x] T. 1. p. 263, 265.

after reciting the Paſſage in *Latin*, *Quis neſcit*, *&c.* he ſays expreſly, the [z] Author *does not ſay according to the Manner preſcribed by the* Laws *of the* Realm, (which he ſays *might give us a Pretence to ſhuffle*) *but according to what their* Statutes *require.* We have ſeen enough in this Treatiſe already, to ſhew that the *Father* is ready upon Occaſion to *retract* what he had ſaid before; and here we ſee the ſame again, that he could firſt give this Senſe of the Words, *that they were not ordained according to the* Laws *of the* Realm, and can now deny that they have that Senſe, *that they were not ordained according to the* Laws *of the* Realm. But what *Statutes* then does he underſtand the Author to mean by *veſtrorum Statutorum*, or *the very Statutes?* He tells us preſently, with nothing to oblige us to believe him but his own Confidence, that [a] *the Words cannot be underſtood but of the* (Statute in the) *thirty ſixth Article of the Doctrine of the Church of* England, *which preſcribes the Uſe of King* Edward's *Ordinal, and was confirmed by them in the Convocation Ann.* 1562.

Muſt we not now ſee a Neceſſity to reform our *Law-Dictionaries*, at leaſt under the Word *Statute*; that it may be known what *new Acceptation* the Word is to have from this time, upon the Authority of a *Critick* in our Language; that now, whatever elſe it ſignifies in our Law, it muſt ſometimes be taken for an Article of the Doctrine of our Church, ſet forth in Convocation? And is it not a new Diſcovery in our Conſtitution, that a Convocation has Authority to make a *Statute*, and that it appears clearly in *Stapleton*, that what he calls a *very Statute*, is no more than an *Article* of *Convocation?* I thought once I might offer a Conjecture, that *Le Quien* might take this Way of reconciling one of the Contradictions which he had led his Au-

[z] P. 57. [a] Ibid.

thor

thor into, of making King *Edward*'s Statute both *revived*, and *not revived: viz.* by saying, [b] *That King* Edward's *Statute for the Ordinal was not revived in the Queen's first Parliament*, An. 1559. but *That it was revived afterwards in her first Convocation*, Ann. 1562. And it must be some Satisfaction to see that the *Father* himself is pleased to shew that, in what I then modestly offered, I was not mistaken.

His Interpretation of Harding's *Words,* Ancient Bishops.

What I have farther to lay before the Reader, are some more such Improvements in the *English* Language, or Discoveries in our History. *Harding*, after he had spoken of *Parker*'s [c] *not having Three Bishops in the Realm* to lay Hands upon him, soon tells *Jewell*, *There were* Ancient *Bishops enough in* England, *who either were not required or refused to consecrate you.* *Harding* meant nothing by *Ancient* Bishops, but the surviving Popish Prelates; but *Le Quien* understood *English* better, and tells us he means Bishops of the [d] *Ancient Ordination*, such as received their Consecration by the *Pontifical*, in King *Henry* VIII. or Queen *Mary*'s time. The Use he makes of this Criticism manifests the Design of it, which is to make his Readers believe, that there were no Protestant Bishops in being, or in the Realm, who had been consecrated in King *Henry*'s Reign, at the time when *Parker* and his Brethren were to be consecrated. *Harding*, [e] he says, *knew very well that there was no Bishop to be found of the* Ancient Ordination, *who would be* Parker's *Consecrator*; and then asks, with an Air of Triumph, *Where therefore were* William Barlow, John *or* Richard *of* Bedford, *and* John *of* Thetford, *whom we have the Confidence to give them for Bishops consecrated according to the* Old Form, *and named by the Queen to consecrate our Metropolitan* Parker? No doubt our first Metropolitan,

[b] Sup. p. 316. [c] Sup. p. 440. [d] P. 89. [e] Ibid.

and the Whole Succeſſion from him, muſt fall down, and can never ſtand before this Argument! If there were no ſuch Men as *Barlow*, and the two Suffragans of *Bedford* and *Thetford*, to be put in Commiſſion by the Queen's Mandate to confirm and conſecrate *Parker*, if this be plainly proved here from *Harding*'s Words; never let us contend any farther for the Truth of our Regiſter, or of the Fact of the *Lambeth* Ordinations!

His pretended Diſcoveries in Bonner's *Caſe.*

The other Diſcoveries relate to the Caſe between *Bonner* and *Horne*, where firſt, we find he perſiſts in declaring that the Caſe by Law belonged to the Cognizance of a [f] *Middleſex* Jury, but was taken away from them, contrary to the Stat. 5 *Eliz.* and committed to a Jury of *Surrey*. He drops now its being done at *Horne*'s Demand, and not *Bonner*'s, for which before [g] he vouched the Authority of *Dyer*'s *Reports:* However, what he ſays now he tells us is warranted by the very Text of *Dyer*, and [h] ſets down moſt of it agreeably to my Tranſlation [i], as far as to *Men of the County of* Surrey; where he is now willing to drop his *Hamlet* [k] *Vicanet* in *Southwark*, in the Dioceſs of *Wincheſter*; and that would be no great matter, if he had not after it ſuppreſſed the Reaſon that is immediately given in the *Report* [l] for the Court's ordering the Trial to be by a Jury of *Surrey*, and not of *Middleſex*; becauſe *no Mention is made in the Statute* (5 Eliz.) *of the Trial, but only of the Indictment, and the Indictment is warranted to be in the County where the King's Bench is ſitting.* If the *Statute* mentioned only the *Indictment*, and that was laid before, and found by, a Jury of *Middleſex*, that being the County wherein the King's Bench was ſitting; this was legal according to the Statute, and it would have been illegal to commit

[f] P. 145, 150. [g] Sup. p. 218, 219. [h] P. 150, 151.
[i] Sup. ibid. [k] T. 1. p. 251. ſup. p. 218. [l] Sup. p. 219.

the

the Bill of Indictment to a Jury of another County; but the Statute not mentioning the *Trial*, that by Law was to be by a Jury of *Surrey*, *Surrey* being the County and Neighbourhood where the Fact was committed. Here he may ſee at laſt, that the Cauſe muſt have paſſed under the Cognizance of two Juries; the Jury of *Middleſex*, to find or reject the Bill of Indictment; and the Jury of *Surrey*, to try the Iſſue, and either to acquit or convict *Bonner* of a *Præmunire* for refuſing the Oath. This was ſhewed him clearly and fully by his Learned [m] *Adverſary*; but he was not inclined to receive Correction or Inſtruction from the Hand of one, that could ſubmit to have his Information, from ſome *Engliſh* Heretick, perhaps, of the *Long Robe*.

He tells us next, that the [n] *Jury was ready to declare* (he means bring in their Verdict) *upon the Fact of* Horne's *Conſecration, but were ſtopt*; that is, not ſuffered to proceed. For this, in his firſt Treatiſe, he cites [o] *Heylin*, "who, he tells us, very ingenuouſly declares that they were going "to give Judgment upon the Proceſs, when the "Cognizance of it was taken away from the "*Middleſex* Jury, and committed to that of *Sur*-"*rey*." F. *Le Courayer* [p] had ſaid enough to oblige him to take the firſt Opportunity to acquaint his Readers in what *Page* of *Heylin* to find the Words which he cites. He ſeems, in this laſt Work, to come prepared to ſatisfy our Expectation, by his citing *Heylin* again, and telling us that [q] *by his Confeſſion there was Delay upon Delay, from Term to Term. Heylin* does ſay, [r] *the Cauſe was put off from Term to Term*; but where does he ſay what follows immediately here in *Le Quien*,

[m] Defence. B. 3. c. 4. p. 341. fr. p. 119. [n] P. 145, 151.
[o] T. 1. p. 251, 252. [p] Defence, ibid. p. 342. fr. p. 120.
[q] P. 151. [r] Tranſcript from his Hiſt. of Reform. in Le Courayer's Defence, p. 345.

That *the very Jury of* Surrey *were ſtopt from proceeding in their Enquiry?* The *Page* where he ſays *the Cauſe was put off from Term to Term*, the *Father* could have told us with Eaſe; but we loſe that Favour, for no other Reaſon, as muſt be conceived, but that the *Page* wherein he ſays the *Jury was ſtopt* could not be found, and he was aſhamed to produce the one without the other.

The *Father* does as good as impeach thoſe that were the [f] *Maſters of our Publick Acts* at that time, of no good Deſign in not taking care *to tranſmit them to Poſterity:* But ſays there is *Proof enough* for his Purpoſe *from thoſe few Monuments that are left us.* Has there then been any ſuch *Monument* tranſmitted to him, whereby Poſterity may be informed of the Proceedings in this Cauſe, after *Mich.* Term, 6 and 7 *Eliz.* when the *Reports* tell us the Cauſe was ordered to be tried by a Jury of *Surrey?* Does it appear, 'That *Bonner* and *Horne* joined Iſſue? 'That there was a *Surrey* Jury *impannelled* to try the Iſſue, and a Day ſet for the Trial? 'That there was one or more *Hearings* wherein the Counſel on both Sides argued before the Jury and the Judges? 'That the Proceedings were come ſo far that the Judges were upon the Point of giving Directions to the Jury, or the Jury ſo fully inſtructed as to be juſt going, if they had not been prevented, to bring in their Verdict? If there are any ſuch Monuments, *Le Quien* is the only Perſon who has the keeping of them. The Author of *Eraſtus ſen.* tells us that [t] *Iſſue was not joined by* Horne's *Default*, and that *the Cauſe never came to a Hearing*, but was *only entered*; if this be true, he muſt have been in perfect Ignorance that there was a *Jury juſt ready to declare upon the Fact.* He complains indeed that *Sentence was delayed for near two Years and a half*; and

[f] P. 149. ſup. p. 481. [t] Sup. p. 212, 222.

this

this may look as if the Matter were for ſo long time ripe for Sentence; but is not this a plain Contradiction to what he ſays of its never coming to an *Hearing* after it was *entered*, or ſo far as that both Parties *joined Iſſue?*

His Charge againſt Le Courayer, *of an Omiſſion of* Heylin's *Words.*

Heylin in the next Words after he ſays *the Cauſe was put off from Term to Term*, ſays, *it came at laſt to be debated among ſt the Judges at* Serjeants *Inn.* Here *Le Quien* ſhews in what Diſpoſition he is to act the Part of a fair Adverſary: He recites [v] F. *Le Courayer's* Tranſlation of this Paſſage in *Heylin*, and the Words are, (as he recites them) *La Cauſe aiant etè diferée de terme en terme, vint enfin à être debatuë au College des Avocats.* Upon this he charges him with the Omiſſion of rendring the Words, *By whom the Cauſe was finally put upon the Iſſue*, and with tranſlating his Author as if he ſaid, *The Cauſe was debated among the* Serjeants, *and they agreed to commit the Trial to a Jury of* Surrey; whereas it ought to have been the *Judges*, and not the *Serjeants*. But pray whoſe is the faulty Omiſſion here, F. *Le Courayer's*, or *Le Quien's*? The Former's Words, as it plainly appears, are, [w] *vint enfin à être debatuë* entre Les Juges *au College des Avocats*, of which *Le Quien's* Recital leaves out, as appears above, *entre Les Juges*, and ſo in him it ſtands as if it were debated and reſolved by the *Serjeants* themſelves in that *Inn*. Let *Le Quien*, if he pleaſes, give the World and his Adverſary an Account of his own ſhewing ſo little *Exactneſs* in this Recital, inſtead of charging him with a Want of *Exactneſs* in his Tranſlation.

And of concealing the Argument of Bonner *or his Counſel in the* Cotton *MS. a-*

He is as juſt to him in laying to his Charge, that he cites the MS. in the *Cotton* Library from Mr. *Strype*, but [x] *takes care to conceal that which is ſaid expreſly in the MS.* That Bonner *attacked* Parker's *Epiſcopacy at the ſame time as he did* Horne's,

[v] P. 162, 163. [w] Def. Liv. 3. c. 4. p. 124. [x] P. 156, 157.

againſt Parker's *Conſecration.*

by another Argument, which is, he ſays, ſuppreſſed by F. *Le Courayer*, and all *Bonner*'s Anſwer pretended to be, *That* Horne *was made Biſhop according to the Book of King* Edward, *not yet re-eſtabliſhed by Parliament.* The *Defence* indeed does ſay, upon the Authority of this MS. that this was *the Cauſe of* Bonner's *Cavil, and nothing elſe:* But does the MS. ſay alſo that *ſomething elſe* beſides was the *Cauſe?* Yes, in the next Words, after it is ſaid, *the Cauſe, and nothing elſe, was, that Book's not being authorized by Parliament*, it follows, *Another Objection was againſt the Conſecration of* Parker, *by whom the reſt were afterwards conſecrated and inveſted*, &c. But is the Reading in the MS. *Another Objection, of* Bonner *and his* Counſel, *was againſt the Conſecration of* Parker, &c. or only [x] *Another Objection was againſt*, &c.? If it be only the latter, what Authority has *Le Quien* to add in the Reading, of *Bonner*, or of *Bonner's Counſel*, when all the Objection that they made, and *nothing elſe*, was that only relating to the Ordinal, which the Author of the MS. had told us before? Might there not be another Objection which he might ſay there was againſt *Parker*'s Ordination, and yet not mean that it was brought by *Bonner* or his Counſel? If there might, this muſt appear to be a plain Inſtance of *Le Quien*'s bold and unwarrantable Forwardneſs, to make the Author of the MS. contradict himſelf, to ſerve his Turn, and ſay that the Cauſe of *Bonner*'s Cavil was *nothing elſe*, and yet was *ſomething elſe*, beſides the non-Re-eſtabliſhment of King *Edward*'s Ordinal. He may think me too modeſt and ſcrupulous that I have not the Confidence to go his Lengths; but I muſt own I ſhould have been glad if the MS. would have given me Authority to make uſe of this Objection as really intended to

[x] Sup. p. 193.

be urged by *Bonner*'s Counſel, becauſe their urging it muſt imply that they and their Client believed and acknowledged that *Parker* had Impoſition of Hands from *Barlow*, *Scory*, *Coverdale* and *Hodgskins*; and therefore cannot be conceived to deny that *Parker* had thoſe four Conſecrators; or to affirm that he had none but *Scory*, at the Tavern. The Objection is, That theſe four had been deprived by Queen *Mary*, and were not reſtored yet by Queen *Elizabeth*; conſequently, they were at that time no *Legal* Biſhops, and therefore *Parker* had not one *Legal* Biſhop at his Conſecration.

How little Service that Argument can do to Le Quien's *Cauſe.*

But is this, as the MS.[y] ſhews, all that the Objection comes to, "That *Parker* was conſecrated "by *Barlow*, *Scory*, *Coverdale* and *Hodgskins*; "but that neither all, or ſo much as one of theſe "four were Biſhops by Law, being not yet re- "ſtored to their Biſhopricks and Juriſdiction of "which they had been deprived by Queen *Mary?*" If the Objection comes to no more, is it not plain that *Le Quien* had very good Reaſon to call in queſtion his Adverſary's *good Faith*, in citing the MS. ſo imperfectly, and leaving out this *Other* formidable Argument of *Bonner* and his *Counſel* againſt the Cauſe which he had taken upon him to defend? The learned and impartial *Author* of the *Defence* is beſt able to give a Reaſon why he did not produce this as *Another Argument* of *Bonner* and his *Counſel*; but to me it ſeems, that if he had, inſtead of being faithful to the Author he cites, he would have been unjuſt to him, in making him ſay firſt, that the non-Re-eſtabliſhment of King *Edward*'s Ordinal was the only Argument upon which *Bonner cavilled* againſt *Horne*'s Conſecration, and *no other*; and then making him ſay preſently, that there was beſides *another Argument*,

[y] Sup. ibid.

upon

upon which he grounded his *Cavil.* But how was it for his Intereſt to diſſemble and conceal this *Other* Argument? Does it ſo far prejudice his and our Cauſe, as to prove that *Parker* had not in *fact* Impoſition of Hands from *Barlow*, *Scory*, *Coverdale* and *Hodgskins*, which is the Point that *Le Quien* maintains throughout his whole firſt Treatiſe? No, it ſuppoſes the quite contrary, that theſe four were actually *Parker*'s Conſecrators. Does it prove then theſe four had not themſelves truly and validly the Epiſcopal Order? No, nor that neither; except their being deprived of their Sees by Queen *Mary* took away their very Orders, as well as their Biſhopricks and Legal Juriſdiction. What does this Argument prove then? That being not poſſeſſed of any Biſhopricks, nor having any Legal Juriſdiction, their Act (as the Author of *Eraſtus ſen.* argues thro' the Second Part of his Book) in laying Hands upon *Parker*, was in Law void and of none effect, and could not give the Arch-Biſhop any Legal Juriſdiction, except Queen *Elizabeth* had reſtored them by Act of Parliament; which as yet ſhe had not done, but only made uſe of her Royal Authority to ſupply ſuch Defects in their Perſons, by adding a Clauſe to her Commiſſion for that Purpoſe.

But *Le Quien* tells us the Argument proves a great deal more: So much, [y] *that it alarmed the Whole Body of the* Engliſh *Clergy, and convinced them that they had neither any Arch-Biſhop nor Biſhop at their Head, having none that had received Epiſcopal Ordination*; and that this obliged them [z] *to find out the Expedient, to pretend that the Cauſe was of too great Importance to be decided in any Court but that of the Parliament, where they were ſure that it would be decreed in their Favour.* How does he prove that this Argument had ſuch an Effect? He

[y] P. 157. [z] Ibid.

ſays

ſays *It confirmed all that* (he had ſhewed) Stapleton *declares* of the Ordination of our Biſhops. Does then all that *Stapleton* declares amount to no more, than that *Parker*'s Conſecrators (as it is in the MS.) had been deprived by Queen *Mary*, *and not yet reſtored*, and conſequently were by Law no *Engliſh* Biſhops? Or is their not being Biſhops *by Law* the ſame as their not having at all the Epiſcopal Order according to Chriſt's Inſtitution, and conſequently their being uncapable to give *Parker* Epiſcopal Conſecration? So that he and his Brethren (as *Le Quien* ſays here) [a] *ſacrilegiouſly uſurped and took upon them the Epiſcopal Function without Conſecration, without the Impoſition of Hands of any Biſhop? Upon this Account the MS.* he ſays, *is a new Teſtimony againſt their having the Epiſcopal Order, as the Author of the* Defence *was himſelf*, he ſays, *very ſenſible.* I muſt rather ſay, that the Reader cannot but be ſenſible, that *Le Quien*'s Confidence in citing this MS. as for his Purpoſe, and charging his Adverſary with Unfaithfulneſs in not making the like Uſe of it, turns to the quite contrary Account, and does, inſtead of ſerving his Cauſe, or expoſing his Adverſary, only make the *Father* himſelf ſtill appear the more ridiculous.

I have before conſidered this Objection [b], as common among the Popiſh Party at that time, and probably meant by *Bonner* himſelf in the Heads of his *Defence*, tho' not intended to be pleaded, if the Cauſe had come to an Hearing, by his Counſel, but only the Other, of the non-Re-eſtabliſhment of King *Edward*'s Form. But as *Le Quien* makes it now their principal Argument, it proves againſt him, with the greater Advantage, that both the reſt of the Party, and *Bonner* himſelf, diſclaimed their having any Knowledge of the Ordination at the Tavern, and confeſſed their Belief

[a] P. 158. [b] Sup. p. 204, & ſeq.

of

of *Parker*'s being conſecrated by thoſe very Perſons whom the Regiſter relates to have been his Conſecrators.

The Reader has likewiſe ſeen before [c] a ſufficient Anſwer to that which *Le Quien* repeats here [d] again from *Stapleton*, relating to *Bonner*'s Caſe.

Nothing therefore now remains, but to ſhew what at laſt is come to be the Iſſue of the Diſpute about the Fact of the Ordination of our Firſt Biſhops, after the Pains *Le Quien* has taken in proſecuting the Argument in both his Treatiſes. He began with the Relation of the Tavern-Story, and at firſt ſet it forth with that Advantage, as to tell us it was [e] *perfectly authorized by the Teſtimony of the Puritans*, in the *Demonſtration* of their *Diſcipline*, That *our Ordinations were made in a Corner*. If it appeared to have ſo much Authority from the Teſtimony of the *Puritans*, how much more muſt we think it had from the Teſtimonies of the *Catholicks?* But after this, and ſome ſuch Arguments, the *Father* finds it convenient to own [f], that *they do not come up to a perfect Demonſtration*, and *that he will not engage himſelf to defend the Story abſolutely as certain and undoubted*. This was to leave a Way open for him to come off in due time, and to prepare us to expect that he might, as he does now in this Treatiſe [g], give the Story up for a Fable and Romance. And it were no matter for him to give it that Name, if the only Author of it were the Poet *Ward*, in his *Canto's* of the *Reformation*; but what muſt we think of the other Perſons, who have ſet their Names to the Hiſtory, Perſons who made ſo great a Figure in their Church, a Gentleman [h] of Quality, Parts and Judgment, a

[c] Sup. p. 321, & ſeq. [d] P. 145, &c. [e] T. 1. p. 202.
[f] Ibid. p. 211. [g] Part 1. p. 180. [h] Sup. p. 7, 65.

Profeſſor

[i] Profeſſor at *Rheims*, a [k] Doctor of the *Sorbonne*, and *Three* [l] *Fathers* of the celebrated *Ignatian* Order? Does the *Father* now give us up theſe Hiſtorians as the Inventors or Publiſhers of a *Romance?* And pray what ſort of Romance is it? An innocent Fiction for the Entertainment and Diverſion of their Readers, or a wicked and ſcandalous *Forgery*, and a deteſtable and helliſh *Calumny*, deſigned (by a falſe and abſurd Report of a Fact that never was or could be, in the Manner as themſelves report it) to make the Names and Memory of our Firſt Biſhops be reflected upon with the utmoſt Abhorrence, and the Orders which we derive from them rejected by the Chriſtian World with the greateſt Indignation and Contempt? The *Father*, after an Attempt to ſatisfy us, that there is next to a *Demonſtration* of the Truth of this *vile Impoſture*, thinks it a very great Condeſcention to allow at laſt that it may be, for ought he knows, no more than a *Romance!*

But he comforts himſelf with having this to return upon us, [m] That the Relation in the *Lambeth* Regiſter deſerves no better Name and Character; but is proved to be *Fiction and Forgery*, by *Witneſſes* who could not be ignorant of what paſſed at that time, and yet deny the very *Fact* of the Conſecrations of our Biſhops. We own that they deny their Orders, but mean nothing but a Denial of the *Validity*, and not of the *Fact* of their Conſecrations; and F. *Le Quien* owns that this is the State of the Queſtion, and takes upon him, in his firſt Treatiſe, to prove their Denial of the Fact, from *Bonner*'s Plea, and the Teſtimonies of *Stapleton*, *Harding* and *Sanders*, who all, he pretends, declare that our Prelates had not Impoſition of Hands from the Perſons named in the Re-

[i] Sup. p. 15, 70. [k] Sup. p. 16. [l] Sup. p. 78.
[m] Ibid. p. 119, 180. ſup. p. 475.

giſter,

gifter, nor any Impoſition of Hands *at all.* I have ſhewed that his Proofs, in all the Places he alledges, come to no more than that they deny their having the Impoſition of *Biſhops* Hands; and have ſince had the Satisfaction to ſee, that himſelf, in his Second Work, repeats the ſame Paſſages over again for a Proof of nothing but this Concluſion, not that they had no Impoſition of Hands *at all*, or not from their reputed Conſecrators, but that they had not *Epiſcopal* Impoſition of Hands.

May I not here congratulate *Le Quien*, as I did his *Follower* the *Remarker* [n], upon his having the Honour of a *compleat Victory* over his Adverſaries, who all of them are ready to ſubmit to his *Demonſtration*, that there is good Evidence from *Stapleton*, *Harding*, *&c.* of their denying that our Prelates ever had the Impoſition of *Biſhops* Hands? And can their denying that *Parker*, *&c.* had Epiſcopal Conſecration be any thing elſe but a Denial of their being conſecrated by Perſons qualified to give them a *true* and *valid* Conſecration? And might they not, notwithſtanding this Denial, acknowledge that they had Hands laid upon them by ſuch Perſons as *Barlow* and *Scory*, *&c.* ſuch as, in their Judgment, could not *truly* and *validly* ordain them, tho' they might *in fact* give them Impoſition of Hands? If it be true that they might deny them to be *validly* ordained, and yet acknowledge the Fact of their Ordination: Can *Le Quien* then pretend that their Denial of the Validity of the Ordination by theſe Perſons, is the ſame with a Denial of the Fact of their ever having Hands laid upon them by theſe Perſons? Yes, the *Father* finds himſelf obliged to own that which implies a Denial of the Validity only, and yet is poſitive that

[n] Sup. p. 295.

it implies a Denial of the Fact. This is what he is reduced to in this Particular, by a Self-Conviction that he was in the wrong in the whole Courſe of the Diſpute, in his Treatiſe of 1725. but reſolving ſtill, in his Other Treatiſe of this Year, not to give up the main Point, but at all Adventures to maintain, that let their Writers ſay what they will, they ſhall deny the *very Fact* of our Firſt Ordinations. And is not this an extraordinary Way of bringing his Adverſaries to Reaſon? to attack them firſt very furiouſly, and then to cool upon ſecond Thoughts, and to come over to their Side; and yet to continue his Attack upon them, and require them to ſurrender at Diſcretion, and to take what *Quarter* the *Conqueror* is pleaſed to give them? that is, to own that their Writers denying that *Parker* and his Brethren had true Biſhops for their Conſecrators, is the ſame as denying that they were conſecrated by the Perſons named in the Acts of their Conſecration, or that the Office was performed by any Perſons whatſoever.

FINIS.

A Defence of the Validity of the Engliſh Ordinations, and of the Succeſſion of the Biſhops in the Church of England: Together with Proofs juſtifying the Facts advanced in this Treatiſe. Written in French by the Reverend Father Peter Francis le Courayer, Canon Regular and Librarian of St. Geneviéve at Paris. Tranſlated into Engliſh by Daniel Williams, Presbyter of the Church of England. To which is prefix'd, A Letter from the Author to the Tranſlator. The ſecond Edition, corrected from ſeveral Errors, as well as ſome Omiſſions that crept into the firſt Edition, 8vo. 1728.

A Defence of the Diſſertation on the Validity of the Engliſh Ordinations. Againſt the ſeveral Anſwers made to it. With proper Vouchers for the Facts advanced in that Work. In Two Volumes, 8vo. By the ſame Author. 1728.

The Divine Right of Epiſcopacy, and the Neceſſity of an Epiſcopal Commiſſion for preaching God's Word, and for the valid Miniſtration of the Chriſtian Sacraments, proved from the Holy Scriptures, and the Doctrine and Practice of the Primitive Church. Together with an impartial Account of the falſe Principles of Papiſts, Lutherans, and Calviniſts, concerning the Identity of Biſhops and Presbyters. Alſo the valid Succeſſion of our Engliſh Biſhops vindicated, againſt the Objections of Presbyterians and Romaniſts. And the Popiſh Fable of the Nag's-Head Conſecration of Arch-Biſhop Parker fully refuted. By Thomas Brett, L. L. D. The Second Edition, 8vo. 1727.



Biſſe's Beauty of Holineſs in the Common Prayer. 8vo.

——— Decency and Order in Publick Worſhip. 8vo.

——— Single Sermons on ſeveral Occaſions.

Mangey's Diſcourſes on the Lord's Prayer. 8vo.

——— Defence of the Biſhop of London's Letter to his Clergy.

——— Anſwer to Toland's Nazarenus. 8vo.

——— Five ſingle Sermons. 8vo.

Brandt's Hiſtory of the Reformation abridg'd, 2 Vols. 8vo.

Bennet's Diſcourſe of Schiſm. 8vo.

Bragg on the Miracles of our Bleſſed Saviour. 2 Vols. 8vo.

Beveridge's Private Thoughts.

——— Sermons.

——— on the 39 Articles.

A Commentary on all the Books of the Old and New Teſtament. by Bp. Patrick, Mr. Lowth, and Dr. Whitby, in ſix Vols. Folio.

Goodman's Penitent pardoned. 8vo. 1724.

——— Winter Evening Conference. 8vo.

——— Old Religion. 12mo.